Studies in Marxism, Vol. 21

RACISM, IMPERIALISM, & PEACE

Selected Essays by

HERBERT APTHEKER

Edited by

Marvin J. Berlowitz and Carol E. Morgan

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/racismimperialis0000apth

Studies in Marxism, Vol. 21

RACISM, IMPERIALISM, & PEACE

Selected Essays by Herbert Aptheker

Edited by

Marvin J. Berlowitz and Carol E. Morgan

MEP Publications
Minneapolis

MEP Publications
c/o Anthropology Department
University of Minnesota
215 Ford Hall; 224 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Copyright © Marxist Educational Press 1987
All rights reserved

In loving memory of Henry Winston

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Aptheker, Herbert, 1915–
Racism, imperialism, & peace

(Studies in Marxism ; vol. 21) Bibliography: p.
Includes index.
1. Racism–United States. 2. United States–Race relations. 3. Afro-Americans–History. 4. Racism. I. Berlowitz, Marvin J., 1942– . II. Morgan, Carol E. III. Title. IV. Title: Racism, imperialism, & peace. V. Series: Studies in Marxism (Minneapolis, Minn.) ; v. 21.
E185.A62 1987 973'.0496073 87-2984
ISBN 0-930656-49-0
ISBN 0-930656-50-4 (pbk.)

Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

Editors' Preface	7
PART I. U. S. HISTORY; BLACK-WHITE UNITY	25
"We Will be Free": Advertisements for Runaways and the Reality of American Slavery	25
The Abolitionist Movement	50
Toward Counterrevolution: The Slaveowners and Secession	56
Black-White Unity: A Basic Theme and Need in United States History	62
PART II. RACISM AND HISTORIOGRAPHY	69
Racism and Historiography	69
American History: Illusion and Reality	73
Heavenly Days in Dixie: Or, the Time of Their Lives [I]	78
Heavenly Days in Dixie: Or, the Time of Their Lives [II]	94
Racism and Counterrevolution	109
John Brown and the Writing of History	117
Southerners on Southern History	123
PART III. RACISM AND IMPERIALISM	132
U.S. Imperialism and Racism: A History	132
Sterilization and Imperialism	143
PART IV. RACISM AND ITS REMEDIES	157
Racism, Anti-Semitism, and Affirmative Action	157
Racism, Fascism, and Human Rights	163
PART V. PEACE AND JUSTICE	171
Moorfield Storey: Lessons for Today	171
W. E. B. Du Bois and Africa	178
W. E. B. Du Bois—A Man for Peace	197
INDEX OF NAMES	205

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The editors wish to thank the University of Santa Clara, *Political Affairs,* and *Jewish Affairs* for permission to draw upon writings of Herbert Aptheker which were first published by them. The essays in this volume have been edited slightly, or combined, primarily for conciseness, in consultation with the author, from essays which in some cases appeared originally under different titles. The titles of the essays as they appear in the present volume are listed below, followed by the source date of original publication.

"We Will Be Free": Advertisements for Runaways and the Reality of American Slavery. Occasional Paper No. 1, Ethnic Studies Program, University of Santa Clara, 1984

The Abolitionist Movement. *Political Affairs*, Feb. 1976

Toward Counterrevolution: The Slaveowners and Secession. *Political Affairs*, Apr. 1973

Black-White Unity: A Basic Theme and Need in United States History. *Political Affairs*, Feb. 1975

Racism and Historiography. *Political Affairs*, May 1970

American History: Illusion and Reality. *Political Affairs*, Jan. 1978

Heavenly Days in Dixie: Or, the Time of Their Lives. *Political Affairs*, June and July 1974

Racism and Counterrevolution. *Political Affairs*, Sept. 1971

John Brown and the Writing of History. *Political Affairs*, Sept. 1973

Southerners on Southern History. *Political Affairs*, Feb. 1971

U.S. Imperialism and Racism: A History. *Political Affairs*, July 1973

Sterilization and Imperialism. *Political Affairs*, Jan. 1974

Racism, Anti-Semitism, and Affirmative Action. *Jewish Affairs*, Jan.–Feb. 1978

Racism, Fascism, and Human Rights. *Political Affairs*, Mar. 1974, Apr. 1978

Moorfield Storey: Lessons for Today. *Political Affairs*, June 1972

W. E. B. Du Bois and Africa. *Political Affairs*, Mar. 1981

W. E. B. Du Bois: Man for Peace. *Political Affairs*, Aug. 1982

EDITORS' PREFACE

This volume presents a dialectical-materialist analysis by a leading scholar-activist, Herbert Aptheker, of issues confronting the United States today. It brings together a representative sample of his continuing contributions to the writing of history, his penetrating critiques of current historiography, and his analysis of the impact of racism and imperialism, both in history and at present. The conclusion which Aptheker draws from this analysis is that the struggle for peace, democracy, and equality must continue and, more importantly, must be a struggle which unites and thereby strengthens each cause. Throughout, the analysis is informed by Marxist theory, marked by a scathing indictment of racism and imperialism, and touched with a deep sense of humanism. The complexities of the current historical epoch require nothing less.

Capitalism in the United States now finds itself in a structural crisis which is no longer simply a function of cycles of boom and depression. Crises are more prolonged and deeper, and boom periods shorter and more shallow, with high rates of unemployment a permanent feature. The limits imposed upon U.S. imperialism by the spread of socialism and the irreversible tide of victories for national-liberation struggles intensify the exploitation of the working class here at home. The priorities of capitalism, which place profit over human needs, create a situation in which the export of capital and the deployment of automation at home intensify oppression both here and abroad, rather than benefit the working class. Furthermore, they necessitate unprecedented military expenditures to which social services as well as global security are sacrificed.

The ideological justification for these developments revives old theories in new forms, all of which serve to obfuscate the role of racism and its connections with imperialism. Natural law is ideal for this purpose since it not only masks the role of the structural constraints of capitalism but absolves individuals of any sense of responsibility. E. O. Wilson of Harvard arises as the new pied piper of eugenics. The ideologues of the Chicago school of urban sociology continue to explain residential segregation as the mere unfolding of the laws of human ecology with school segregation as nothing more than an unfortunate but inevitable consequence for

which the legal responsibility cannot be determined. Racism becomes merely an attitude to be resolved in the mind, rather than through struggle against its material and ideological forms.

In this atmosphere, the hard-won victories of the working class have come under increasing attack. This may be exemplified by the current assault on public education, an institution for which the working class has consistently struggled. We see a proliferation of national reports on the crisis in education maintaining that public schools were never meant to educate poor and minority students. The call of cost-effectiveness signals an assault on compensatory and developmental education programs. Elitist programs for the gifted are put forth as the most logical approach to cost-effectiveness. Many bourgeois scholars who have never been influenced by data which question their partisan commitment to capitalism call for the abandonment of the programmatic victories of the Civil Rights movement, which they allege were never viable.

Herein lies the significance of the work of Herbert Aptheker and the present volume of his writings. For more than four decades, Aptheker has defended working-class interests and struggled against the racism that pervades U.S. society. He has brought to academic circles the same courage he demonstrated in his trade-union organizing in the South, often in the face of terrorism waged by the Ku Klux Klan, and which persisted in his role as a combat soldier in Europe during the Second World War, where he rose from the rank of private to major. In the area of ideological struggle, he has wielded a double-edged sword of working-class partisanship and the science of Marxism-Leninism, forged in the fires of intellectual rigor, against the sophists who serve the forces of racism, such as U. B. Phillips and Stanley Elkins, and more recently, Arthur Jensen, William Shockley, Patrick Moynihan, and Nathan Glazer.

Amidst the ideological confusion that resulted from McCarthyism, which gave rise to New Left ideology and so-called neo-Marxist interpretations, Herbert Aptheker has retained his ideological clarity to emerge as one of the few leading Marxist-Leninists widely recognized in the academic community. The seeds of his valiant and undaunted consistency are being borne in the fruits of Marxist scholarship currently being produced by young scholars who were educated in the 1960s. The significance of his work is gaining recognition in the historical profession, with special conference sessions being devoted to his contributions by the American Historical Association, the Southern Historical Association, and the Organization of American Historians. A two-day conference on the influence of Aptheker's work was recently held at Stanford University, with

scholars from England, Canada, and the United States participating.

Herbert Aptheker's work is an inspiration and a benchmark in both form and content for all progressive scholars who have a commitment to intellectual honesty and rigor. It is a source of enlightenment for those who have been subjected to an educational system which has consistently suppressed and distorted the truth in the interest of the capitalist class, enabling us to pick up the sword and continue the struggle against racism and reaction. Furthermore, readers will find its polemical style a refreshing change of pace and a welcome relief from the stifled pedantry so characteristic of bourgeois scholarship.

U.S. HISTORY: BLACK-WHITE UNITY

Herbert Aptheker's impact on the writing of U.S. history, highlighting the integral and extraordinary role of Black people in the making of that history, has been immeasurable. *American Negro Slave Revolts*, appearing first in 1943, represented the first attempt to document in considerable detail the extent of slave unrest in the antebellum South. Although its conclusions have often been at the center of scholarly controversy in the intervening years, the work has more than stood the test of time.[1]

In the first selection of this volume, Aptheker draws on his experience in handling the documents and, continuing a tradition which he has upheld for over forty years, demonstrates the importance of examining all aspects of the slave order. He points out that by looking only at the advertisements for runaway slaves, we learn a great deal about the extent of slave resistance, the role of some whites in assisting that resistance, and the history of the separate communities of former slaves, the maroons. As Aptheker notes, these advertisements functioned as letters among slaveowners, revealing "the basic brutality" of the institution itself. They also, somewhat ironically, served as a means by which the slaves themselves spoke of their rights and desire for freedom. Looking at these advertisements in this way, Aptheker uncovers more of the living reality of slavery.

In the following selections, Aptheker puts forward a penetrating Marxist analysis of the history of the United States from the pre-Civil War period through the realization of the second American revolution, which culminated in the Emancipation Proclamation and the salvation of the nation. He points out that the first revolution, which led to independence, could only be considered a limited success because, in its failure to put an end to slavery, it "left a cancer in the bowels of the new Republic" ("Black-White Unity," p. 64).[2]

Only through continual resistance on the part of the slaves themselves, accompanied by a united Black-white abolitionist movement, was it possible to bring an end to slavery and thereby further the development of the Union in a democratic direction.

Central to Aptheker's analysis of this unfolding drama is the issue of property relations. As he first pointed out in *American Negro Slave Revolts*,

> most slaves were owned as investments, not as ornaments or commodities of consumption. . . . Slaves were instruments of production, were means by which men who owned land were able to produce tobacco and rice and sugar and cotton to be sold and to return them a profit.[3]

As the economy came to be increasingly industrialized in the mid-nineteenth century, however, the holders of property in the form of slaves came to be vastly outnumbered. The question now became, as Marx and Engels wrote in 1861, "whether the twenty million free men of the North should subordinate themselves any longer to an oligarchy of three hundred thousand slaveholders."[4] In refusing to accept such subordination, the northern industrial interests were forced to ally with the antislavery cause. Aptheker effectively argues that in so doing these interests were following a revolutionary course, because at the core of the battle to end slavery was an attack on the rights of property, property in human flesh. With the holders of slaves then reigning as the dominant power in the nation, an attack on that particular form of property was of decisive importance, for it challenged the property rights that constituted the very foundations of the slaveholders' rule.

The abolitionist movement itself, Aptheker further demonstrates, was thus revolutionary in content, not a reformist, white-dominated struggle as other historians have contended.[5] Based on the unity of Black and white and inspired by the "activities of the Negro people themselves, . . . their flights, their newspapers, their societies, their speakers, their individual outbreaks, their revolts and plots," it had a significance that transcended its immediate goals, for it touched all democratic causes, particularly those of women, labor, and oppressed peoples throughout the world.[6]

Such a revolutionary movement was further necessitated, Aptheker points out, by the "frantic effort at counterrevolution" undertaken by the slaveholding oligarchy. Out of desperation, and against the will of the majority of white Southerners, that hitherto dominant power resorted to force, making war upon the Union itself. To preserve the Union, it now became necessary to strip away the source of the slaveholders' power and abolish slavery. And to

abolish slavery, it was necessary to preserve the Union. Thus, in order to thwart the attempted counterrevolution, the defense of the Union and the drive to abolish slavery came to require a revolution ("Toward Counterrevolution," p. 56).

Through this analysis, the dialectical motion inherent in the historical process is revealed in relation to the early history of the United States. By the 1840s, the holding of property in the form of slaves was coming into sharp conflict with the social relations that were becoming increasingly dominant, based on wage labor. Industrial capitalism, already triumphant in England, was bursting the bounds imposed by the slave system, searching for new markets for both goods and capital. This conflict brought forth a challenge to the existence of slavery in the form of a movement whose composition was broad and whose content was revolutionary. The history of the United States was qualitatively altered as a result, allowing for the full development of industrial capitalism and the political domination of the industrial bourgeoisie. Yet even as that class gained ascendance, it was not to remain unfettered, for simultaneously with its creation, a revolutionary tradition of resistance had been forged and was to continue to exert its influence.

Black people, Aptheker points out, have always been at the forefront of that side of our nation's history associated with resistance to oppression and the struggle for democracy and freedom. The history of Black people is not, therefore, somehow isolated from the mainstream. Rather, it is a uniquely revolutionary history which has consistently driven the struggle forward and enriched it. Historians, however, as a result of racism, have largely failed to recognize this characteristic of Black history. Accordingly, as Aptheker argues in the second section of this volume, the entire history of the United States has been falsified.

RACISM AND HISTORIOGRAPHY

A prime example of such falsification is the work *Time on the Cross* by Robert W. Fogel and Stanley L. Engerman. In an influential article which first appeared in 1974, Aptheker takes the authors to task for their uncritical use of defective census figures to defend their racist conclusions. More importantly, however, he criticizes this work for exemplifying the error made by historians in general: that of overlooking the dialectics of oppression. As a result of this limited perspective, Aptheker contends, historians have accepted racist stereotypes regarding the nature of the oppressed and have treated them as mere victims. Yet oppression does not merely create victims, it leads to resistance, as Aptheker has demonstrated again and again

throughout his works. And the oppressed "resist in ten thousand ways and forge their own culture, psyche and spirit while doing so" ("Heavenly Days in Dixie," part I, p. 80).

The real crime of historiography in the United States has been to ignore this essential ingredient of our history. Even such leading historians as Henry Steele Commager fail to treat slavery as an integral part of the history of the United States and thereby falsify the entire historical record ("American History: Illusion and Reality," p. 74). The slaves and their descendants disappear from the historical stage and we are left with the Myth of the South and the fantasy of a classless society free of oppression and conflict.

Yet the picture is changing. While racist images continue to emerge, the Myth of the South is being overthrown, primarily under the influence of a new generation of southern historians. The ties between slavery and the subordination of women are being brought out, as is the extent of resistance to reversals of the gains realized during Reconstruction. The dominance of northern capital and the resulting altered class relations are beginning to play a role in analyses of the post-Civil War South. It is to be hoped that, in the writing of history, we are moving in the necessary direction of understanding everything "in terms of the relationship thereto of the Black people in the United States" ("Racism and Historiography," p. 74). Only in this way, as Aptheker points out, can the racism and falsification that have marked historiography in this country be reversed, and the victims of oppression, so long denied their own history, begin to reclaim it.

RACISM AND IMPERIALISM

From this analysis of U.S. history and historiography, Aptheker moves to the global scene, developing the historical links of racism with capitalism and imperialism. In so doing, he draws on the analysis of Karl Marx, who succinctly summarized the origins of this connection:

> The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of the conquest and looting of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of black-skins, signalized the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production.[7]

Aptheker's significant contribution in this section is an explication of the historical development of racism as an ideological bulwark, first for the justification and rationalization of slavery and then for

monopoly capitalism in the United States. He divides this ideological framework into two major components—the religious justification of slavery and the development of scientific racism as a response to the productive relations of monopoly capitalism. He advances the analysis of the impact of monopoly capitalism put forth by various historical revisionists by establishing the dialectical relationship and correspondence between the components of imperialism abroad and the intensification of racism in the consolidation of monopoly capitalism at home. His final major contribution in this chapter is to establish the connection between monopoly capitalism and the neo-Malthusian forms of racism that have given rise to campaigns of sterilization.

Aptheker begins this analysis by stating:

> Racism—i.e., the idea that particular people or peoples are significantly and immutably inferior to other peoples in important characteristics, especially intellectual and moral, and that these stigmata have their origins in biological roots and are therefore unfailingly transmitted from generation to generation—is, historically speaking, a modern idea.

While reactions of fear and hostility toward strangers have recurred throughout history, he continues, that particular meaning of racism

> comes into the so-called Western world with the beginnings of mercantile capitalism in about the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; it is a reflection of that system's conquest of the colored peoples of the world—especially those inhabiting Africa—and of the fact that such conquest meant extraordinary cruelty, naked robbery, systematic slaughter and—above all—enslavement via a highly organized slave trade in a new world, "discovered" and conquered and occupied as part of the appearance and development of that same capitalism. ("U.S. Imperialism and Racism: A History," p. 132)

The ideological justification for slavery was necessary in order to overcome the contradictions it posed for Christians. Aptheker traces the ideological developments which finally offered the resolution of the problem by asserting that the inferiority of African peoples actually

> made it a Christian *duty* on the part of the superior Christian to hold in slavery the inferior one. Here we have the root of the "white man's burden," and the paternalism so significant an

> ingredient in chauvinism, i.e., one must "take care of" his slaves! (Ibid., p. 134)

The second important development was the phenomenon of scientific racism, which was brought into being by the necessities of monopoly capitalism. Although the historical revisionists have made the connection between monopoly capitalism and the development of scientific racism, Aptheker not only elaborates the position, but clarifies the breadth and depth of the material basis for scientific racism and its application to a number of fields. He cites examples from political and economic history and illustrates the application of scientific racism in areas that include, among others, anatomy, anthropology, physiology, psychology, and sociology as well as industrial relations. His content analysis of children's geography books and other popular literature at the turn of the century brings the point home with particular force.

Given the earlier description of the structural crisis of U.S. capitalism, which has created a situation of permanent unemployment with so keen a racist cutting edge that today's Black youth constitute a "surplus generation," Aptheker's establishment of the relationship between imperialism and sterilization is particularly significant. He points out that "victim blaming" theories have taken on such extreme forms within the context of neo-Malthusianism that "one finds seriously expressed the idea that 'people, in themselves, constitute a pollution.' " The gravity of the problem is captured in studies quoted such as a 1973 Senate study which revealed that "in 1972 alone at least 16,000 women and 8,000 men were sterilized by the federal government and that 365 of these were below the age of 21" ("Sterilization and Imperialism," p. 145). The remainder of the paper goes on to trace the scientific and legal history of sterilization.

The structural violence against Black youth such as the army enlistments forced by unemployment, patterns of incarceration and capital punishment, and conditions of ghetto poverty have a genocidal configuration. The implication of Aptheker's work is that the "ultimate solution" is not beyond the realm of possibility. In fact, he points out that racist U.S. laws on eugenics provided precedents for Hitler's legislation.

In sum, Aptheker's treatment of the origins, history, and functions of racism provides an ideological framework for struggle by activists and a conceptual framework and a code of ethics for honest academics. To understand the role of capitalism in generating racism is important for those currently engaged in the struggle against both. This understanding can serve as a strategic guide and, considering the invevitable superseding of capitalism by socialism, can stimulate scientifically based optimism also. In the fourth section of

this volume, Aptheker develops philosophical and legal arguments that may further aid in that struggle.

RACISM AND ITS REMEDIES

The history of racism is replete with traditional conceptions of violence including kidnapping, enslavement, rape, torture, and the terrorism of numerous lynching campaigns. However, the most pervasive form of racist violence is the structural violence affecting Black people in the United States, which manifests itself systemically in forms such as lower life expectancies, higher infant-mortality rates, and dehumanizing living conditions and subminimal standards of living conditioned by chronic unemployment, underemployment, and superexploitation at the point of production. Given this concrete expression of racism, the struggle against it must be active, taking on material forms. Aptheker makes a case for objective legal remedies including affirmative action and legislation making racism a criminal act, including the dissemination of racist propaganda and the organization of terrorist groups such as the Nazis and the Ku Klux Klan. In so doing, he advances the following thesis: "The history of racist ideology and its promulgation show that it is never an *abstraction* but historically always has been part of a sustained campaign for intensified racist *practice*" ("Racism, Fascism and Human Rights," p. 169).

As a Marxist, Aptheker utilizes the philosophical tools of dialectical and historical materialism, ignored by liberal ideology. The idealist conception views racism as an ideological abstraction limiting struggle to combatting attitudes and stereotypes which exist in the mind. The materialist perspective, in contrast, permits Aptheker to view racism as a rationalization linked with the intensification of racist abuses associated with slavery, monopoly capitalism, imperialism, and fascism. The materialist view conceives of phenomena as objectively verifiable; therefore the structural violence cited earlier may be seen as an objective consequence of racism. This conception forms the basis for Aptheker's criticism of actions by reactionary members of the judicial and legislative branches of government to to destroy the effectiveness of legislation for affirmative action and desegregation by requiring that plaintiffs demonstrate that which is most readily veiled: intent and conscious motivation.

Furthermore, the dialectical view of society permits Aptheker to break from static metaphysical interpretations of quotas which view them as discriminatory regardless of time, place, and circumstance. Whereas quotas had previously been employed solely in an exclusive manner, he contends, affirmative action quotas function to include those previously confronting discrimination. In response to

metaphysical interpretations of the Constitution based on a strict constructionist approach, Aptheker points to the contradictions inherent in libeling and terrorizing racial minorities in the myopic exercise of the First Amendment. Acts of racist violence, he argues, should not be defended by law but should be met with legal remedies.

Aptheker then outlines the precedents for antiracist legislation. These include the Potsdam Treaty of 1945 and such United Nations covenants as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention Against Genocide, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. His background discussion includes a history of petitions being presented to the United Nations on behalf of Afro-Americans by such U.S. organizations as the National Negro Congress, the NAACP, and the Civil Rights Congress. He also describes model legislation in force in Britain and the Netherlands. It should also be noted that constitutional provisions exist in the Soviet Union which explicitly make racism, including the dissemination of racist propaganda, a criminal offense.

A concerted assault on racism by such means is particularly vital at this time due to the link, which Aptheker describes, between racism and fascism. In developing this argument, he observes that racism was basic to Germany's succumbing to fascism. The cost to the people of Germany and the world is well known. Racism is endemic in the United States and fascism is carried within the body of a rotting imperialism. Fascism in Germany was a disaster; fascism in the United States, with its power enhanced by its nuclear arsenal, could have catastrophic consequences for all human life on earth ("Racism, Fascism, and Human Rights," p. 170).

The current danger must not be minimized, particularly with the Trilateral Commission being replaced by such ultra-right bodies as the Heritage Foundation, the Committee of the Present Danger, and the Moral Majority in shaping domestic and international policies. In the face of such developments, Aptheker sees a need for a heightened struggle against fascism, with one effective element being "to understand that Nazis and Kluxers must not be free to spread their poisons." Furthermore, he points to the need for a renewal of the historic alliance (currently endangered by the controversy over affirmative action) between progressives in the Jewish community and those struggling for Black equality. With racism functioning as the ideological bulwark of fascism, he contends, such unity is indispensable.

The struggle against racism, Aptheker argues, will have far-reaching historical consequences. He concludes:

> Racism is not some kind of blemish on the nose of U.S. capitalism; racism is of the *definition* of U.S. capitalism. The struggle for equality is not a struggle to join present society; it is a struggle to *transform* present society. The nature of the present social order is racist; extirpating racism is a transforming, a revolutionary struggle given the history and present reality of the United States.
>
> Some light may be shed on this if one thinks of the anti-colonial struggle. Here one finds peoples held in subordination by imperialist powers. The oppressed peoples seek self-determination—national liberation. In seeking that, these people are seeking to *join* the international community of peoples but to join it as equals; in seeking this and in achieving this they are not simply joining but are also transforming.[8]

PEACE AND JUSTICE

The threat of fascism within the United States, with its vast nuclear arsenal lends a sense of urgency not only to the struggle against racism, but to that for peace. Here there is reason for optimism, for in the 1980s the U.S. peace movement has experienced a great resurgence. One consequence of this resurgence has been a proliferation of Peace Education programs in colleges, universities, and elementary and secondary schools across the nation. Herbert Aptheker's critical analyses of the philosophical and historical foundations of peace movements in the United States are a valuable resource for overcoming major deficiencies in the peace movements today.

There is a tendency in the peace movement toward a metaphysical interpretation of the world which perpetuates a static approach to international relations and conflict. The achievement of a global homeostasis is viewed as its primary objective. Therefore, it is limited to political-science constructs such as spheres of influence and the notion of "superpowers" as the prime movers of world history. These limitations are conditioned by an accommodation to Cold War ideology typified by the remark of Betty Reardon, one of the leading spokespersons in Peace Education:

> We do not need to play down the differences between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. nor to take lightly the threat Soviet policies and behaviors have posed to our values and interests but we do need to understand them.[9]

Further limitations of the peace movement are apparent as a result of its virtually exclusively white middle-class composition. Its

liberal ideology gives rise to forms of white chauvinism including paternalism and victim blaming. Blacks are expected to join the movement and accommodate to its dominant ideology and content. When they fail to do so, they are viewed as victims of false consciousness, which is often attributed to the material conditions of racist oppression.

The resulting social composition of the movement further conditions its content. For example, the content of Peace Education is almost exclusively limited to two areas. The first is a micro approach to "conflict resolution," which is limited to interpersonal relations and conflicts within institutions. The second concentrates on the issue of nuclear disarmament and arms limitation, while ignoring the question of national-liberation struggles and other pertinent issues.

The dominant ideology of the peace movement fails to understand the dialectical relationship between peace and social justice. Herbert Aptheker not only provides that dialectical connection, but also brings out the long history of leadership by Blacks who not only pioneered the anti-nuclear movement but integrated it with the struggle for social justice without any accommodation to Cold War ideology. His work challenges the U.S. peace movement to seek out Black leadership rather than attempt to convince Blacks to accommodate to the deficiencies of its white, middle-class liberal ideology.

The ideologically advanced currents of Black leadership of mass struggles on the issues of peace and social justice run deep in the mainstream of U.S. politics. It is scholars such as W. E. B. Du Bois, Herbert Aptheker, and Philip S. Foner who have prevented the total suppression of that heritage. In writing about the life and work of Paul Robeson, Foner makes the following observation:

> Looking back to 1945, the year World War II ended, we can appreciate how far-sighted Paul Robeson was when he denounced the Truman Administration for refusing to take the road of postwar international cooperation with the Soviet Union, which would have forestalled a nuclear arms race, and how correct he was in condemning the cold warriors who maintained that "the only argument the Russians understood was force," and in emphasizing that the Cold War was not primarily a struggle for power with the Soviet Union, but rather a conscious attempt by the United States to crush the Left in this country and to destroy the anticolonial movements in Africa and Asia.[10]

Herbert Aptheker's work further reveals that Robeson's postwar insights formed only one link in a long history of Black contribu-

tions to the peace movement dating back to the turn of the century. He particularly emphasizes the philosophical contributions of W. E. B. Du Bois, stating, "One of his major insights, which he reiterated for some sixty years, was the interpenetration, the causal connection, the dialectical unity between anti-racism, anti-colonialism and anti-war" ("W. E. B. Du Bois: A Man for Peace," p. 197).

Du Bois perceived racism as the primary contradiction inherent within the contemporary capitalist order, as evidenced by his famous statement that "the problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line." In 1900, in a statement following the Pan-African Conference, he appealed for the resolution of this contradiction, declaring:

> If now the world of culture bends itself toward giving Negroes and other dark men the largest and broadest opportunity for education and self-development, then this contact and influence is bound to have a beneficial effect upon the world and hasten progress. ("W. E. B. Du Bois and Africa," p. 180)

Existing peace organizations, however, failed to see the impact such a development would have on the prevention of war. As Du Bois wrote in *The Crisis* of May 1913, which Aptheker quotes, they ignored

> the fact that "the modern lust for land and slaves in Africa, Asia, and the South Seas is the greatest and almost the only cause of war between the so-called civilized people." The "American peace movement," he continued, "thinks it bad policy to take up the problem of machine guns, natives and rubber." "For our part," he concluded, "we think that a little less dignity and dollars and a little more humanity would make the peace movement in America a great philanthropy instead of an aristocratic refuge." ("W. E. B. Du Bois: A Man for Peace," p. 198)

Du Bois, recognizing the economic basis of colonialism and war in an essay which predated Lenin's classic *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, asked, "What do nations care about the cost of war, if by spending a few hundred millions in steel and gunpowder they can gain a thousand millions in diamonds and cocoa?" In gaining their "thousand millions," Du Bois demonstrated, colonialism and racism were inextricably linked, for the colonialists treated their victims "as beasts of burden." He insisted, however, that "We shall not drive war from this world until we treat them as free and equal citizens in a world democracy of all races and nations" ("Du Bois and Africa," p. 186).

It is important to note that the contributions of Du Bois and other Black leaders noted thus far constitute far more than a mere intellectual history. The works of Aptheker contained in this volume demonstrate the following thesis concerning Du Bois:

> Du Bois was both advocate and activist. As advocate, he used the platform, every conceivable literary form and scientific inquiry. . . . As advocate, he was especially journalist-editor and scholar. As an activist, he did not shun agitation; on the contrary, Du Bois thought agitation both healthy and necessary. And as an activist—though temperamentally averse to board meetings—he helped create and sustain vital organizations, especially the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Pan-African movement—seeking the two fundamental commitments of his life: the elimination of racism and colonialism and the elimination of war. ("W. E. B. Du Bois: A Man for Peace," p. 197)

The ideological commitment to the dialectical unity of antiracism, anticolonialism and antimilitarism took on organizational forms. In "Moorfield Storey: Lessons for Today," Aptheker points out that Storey was both the founding president of the American Anti-Imperialist League (1899) and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (1910). He provides us with an anecdote which not only typifies the progressive pioneering role of these organizations, but the courage they demonstrated in confronting Cold War ideology compounded with racism. He relates that in 1927 Secretary of State Frank B. Kellogg attempted to justify U.S. military actions in Latin America with a memorandum to the Senate entitled "Bolshevist Aims and Policies in Latin America." In response, Storey

> tossed aside this "anti-Communist rhetoric" and added: "The oil interests are undoubtedly behind the activity of the State Department and would be glad to embroil us with Mexico." ("Moorfield Storey," p. 173)

Such courage and ideological clarity were not only true of Storey, but were the rule rather than the exception among the Black leaders of the peace movement. As a consistent opponent of Cold War ideology, Du Bois recognized the Soviet Union as a force for peace. Thus, it was no surprise that he was a victim of McCarthyite terrorism. Aptheker provides a full account of his defiance of the threat of jail on the charge of being a foreign agent and his legal triumph against the first wave of McCarthyism.

The peace movement also has a great deal to learn about strategies and tactics from Black leaders. The pioneering efforts in the area of independent political activity did not begin with Jesse Jackson, as Aptheker demonstrates in his account of the NAACP's support of Robert M. LaFollette, the Progressive Party presidential candidate in 1924.

Those sectors of the peace movement who myopically focus on nuclear disarmament also have a great deal to learn from Black leaders in the movement. Both Robeson and Du Bois intensified their peace activities after World War II. Aptheker points out that Du Bois understood that atomic weaponry "revolutionized" war and the world and that, in contrast to World War II, World War III would not be war but "global suicide."

In 1950, it was Du Bois who became a leader of the Peace Information Center, one of whose purposes was to oversee the gathering of signatures for the Stockholm Peace Pledge. The text of this pledge is particularly significant for the current peace movement. It stated:

> We demand the absolute banning of the atomic weapon, an arm of terror and of mass extermination of populations.
>
> We demand the establishment of strict international control to ensure the implementation of this ban.
>
> We consider that the first government henceforth to use the atomic weapon against any country whatsoever will be committing a crime against humanity and should be treated as a war criminal. ("Du Bois: A Man for Peace," p. 201)

Du Bois's vision went beyond the limited view that envisioned a nuclear exchange between the United States and the Soviet Union as the only possible way World War III could begin. Aptheker points out that, in 1960, Du Bois raised the alternative possibility that, "If racism and superexploitation persist in South Africa that may very well be the place wherein a new world war begins." Given the current escalation of armed repression in South Africa combined with the forcible economic penetration and military aggression against the independent states of southern Africa by the South African regime, and the nuclear capability of South Africa's forces, the words of Du Bois may prove to be prophetic.

Aptheker's work on peace and the struggles of Black people provides us with yet another suppressed chapter of U.S. history, that is, the role of Blacks in the origins of the peace movement. His account provides us with a history of the philosophical, ideological, and organizational contributions to the peace movement provided by

its Black leaders. The legacy is so rich that it is imperative that the predominantly white, middle-class liberal peace movement seek Black leadership rather than persist in its attempts to convince Blacks to accommodate to its deficiencies.

This collection of Herbert Aptheker's works constitutes an interdisciplinary approach to the contemporary problems of U.S. society. Teachers, researchers, and policy-oriented intellectuals and practitioners from all walks of life and with orientations ranging from the sociological and historical to the philosophical will find the work an invaluable tool.

Marvin J. Berlowitz
University of Cincinnati

Carol E. Morgan
University of Northern Iowa

NOTES

1. Herbert Aptheker, *American Negro Slave Revolts* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1943; New York: International Publishers, 1983). See John H. Bracey's foreword to 1983 edition. See also: Herbert Shapiro, "The Impact of the Aptheker Thesis: A Retrospective View of *American Negro Slave Revolts*," *Science & Society*, 43, No. 1 (Spring 1984), 52-73; and "We Will Be Free," in this volume.
2. Henceforth references in the text in parentheses denote essays appearing in this volume. For a fuller discussion of the significance of the struggle for independence and its limitations, see Herbert Aptheker, *The Unfolding Drama: Studies in U.S. History*, ed. Bettina Aptheker (New York: International Publishers, 1978), pp. 5-27 and Herbert Aptheker, *The American Revolution, 1763-1783* (New York: International Publishers, 1960).
3. Aptheker, *American Negro Slave Revolts*, p. 132.
4. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The Civil War in the United States*, 3rd ed. (New York: International Publishers, 1961), p. 71.
5. For documentation of the extent of militancy among the abolitionists, see Herbert Aptheker, *To Be Free: Studies in American Negro History*, 2nd ed. (New York: International Publishers, 1969), pp. 41-74.

6. Ibid., p. 39.
7. Karl Marx, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, vol. I, *The Process of Capitalist Production*, trans. Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling, ed. Frederick Engels (New York: International Publishers, 1967), p. 751.
8. Herbert Aptheker, "Affirmative Action: A Response to Critics," *Political Affairs* (June 1981).
9. Betty Reardon, "Nuclear Weapons: Concepts, Issues, and Controversies," *Social Education* (Nov.-Dec. 1983), p. 479.
10. Philip S. Foner, ed., *Paul Robeson Speaks* (Secaucus, N.J.: Citadel Press, 1978), pp. 7-8.

PART I. U.S. HISTORY AND BLACK-WHITE UNITY

"WE WILL BE FREE": ADVERTISEMENTS FOR RUNAWAYS AND THE REALITY OF AMERICAN SLAVERY

In a work published over forty years ago, this writer concluded: "The data herein presented make necessary the revision of the generally accepted notion that [the slave's] response was one of passivity and docility. The evidence, on the contrary, points to the conclusion that discontent and rebelliousness were not only exceedingly common, but, indeed, characteristic of American Negro slaves."[1]

The revision then suggested has been, on the whole, accomplished in the profession. There still is denial—and given the racist nature of the social order there will be stubborn resistance to the smashing of myths useful to that order—but generally speaking the revision stands victorious.

Reversions to the Phillipsian nonsense appear and gain much publicity: witness the travesty called *Slavery* by Stanley Elkins and the sensationally heralded expiation of the slave system—demonstrated with formidable bibliography and infallible computers—by Robert Fogel and Stanley Engerman. Very recently Louisiana State University Press published a traveller's account which, readers were assured, demonstrated the truthfulness of *Gone With the Wind*![2]

Other efforts at sugar-coating recur; thus, the *San Francisco Chronicle* of February 9, 1984, reported that the Department of Commerce and Resources of Virginia had issued a new tourist guide wherein the state's plantations of yesteryear are described as "grand manor houses." Jack Gravely, head of the Virginia chapter of the N.A.A.C.P., did not welcome the change. He thought the name "plantation" should stay "so we won't forget what they were used for." And, in case anyone had forgotten, Mr. Gravely continues: "They were homes for people in chains and slavery. . . . Call them what they were—plantations."

When one recalls that, in the era of slavery, the system itself often was dubbed "the peculiar institution," and the slaves called "domestics" or—in the circumlocution of embarrassed authors of the Constitution—"people held to labor," one will not find strange this

transformation of plantations into grand manors.

St. Clair Drake, having in mind the particular trauma of the forcible expatriation of Africans, wrote: "When the fact has been accepted that African slaves were men and women like all other human beings, it is not difficult to imagine the depth of their fears, the agony of their anxieties, and the profundity of their griefs and sorrows. . . ."[3] Knowing Professor Drake, I am sure he would agree if I added to this telling paragraph that there not only were fears and anxiety and griefs and sorrow, but also aspirations and resistance.

Some of the very considerable literature reflecting these hopes and this resistance that has accumulated since the 1943 publication of the *American Negro Slave Revolts* book, going through 1974, appears in the bibliographical section of its fortieth anniversary edition. Many of the historians who have been contributing to this literature gathered recently for a two-day conference on "Resistance, Not Acquiescence" held in May 1983 at Stanford University. This was sponsored by relevant departments of the host university and those of Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz and Berkeley of the University of California. Papers documenting the theme were presented by experts in African, Caribbean, South American and United States history [since published under the editorship of Gary Y. Okihiro, main convenor of the conference, as: *In Resistance: Studies in African, Afro-American and Caribbean History* (Amherst, University of Massachusetts Press, 1986)].

Further, simply to sample some of the latest literature expressive of this rejection of the docility myth—but *not* to repeat the many sources in the book Professor Okihiro is editing—one may note, for instance, a study of slavery in South Carolina during the first thirty years of the nineteenth century by Michael P. Johnson of the University of California in Irvine. There attention is called to the existence of two kinds of slave groupings in South Carolina—"an urban community and a rural plantation community"—and the conclusion is announced, on the basis of considerable evidence, "that both communities nurtured a spirit of collective resistance." Again, James Oakes of Princeton reported that "wherever there were slave laborers, masters had to deal with resistance."[4]

As a final illustration, Mary F. Berry of Howard and John W. Blassingame of Yale, in their valuable textbook, report that in the United States "slaves engaged almost continuously during the nineteenth century in conspiracies, rebellions, and attempts to escape from bondage."[5] They add: "No rational person could read the monotonous notations in plantation records, newspapers, or slave

autobiographies of floggings, castrations, mutilations, imprisonments, and executions and argue that the bondsmen were content."

The fullest record of this torment, within one source, has come from the work of the late Lathan A. Windley.[6] This consists of his 250-page unpublished dissertation, "A Profile of Runaway Slaves in Virginia and South Carolina from 1730 through 1787"[7] and, especially, the massive four-volume work which—his widow has informed me—Professor Windley "completed a few days before his death."

We offer some preliminary remarks on the four-volume effort, then examine the dissertation and then return to a fairly detailed consideration of the findings in the four volumes.

Windley's published effort contains 1,882 double-column pages; this is entitled *Runaway Slave Advertisements: A Documentary History from the 1730s to 1790.*[8] Volume one treats Virginia and North Carolina, two deals with Maryland, three with South Carolina, and four with Georgia. There is no editorial matter whatsoever; reprinted, verbatim, are advertisements for fugitive slaves published in *all* extant newspapers of the areas and the period, but identical advertisements offered more than once are *not* repeated. Appendices appear in each volume to convey information about slaves who fled more than once and for whom advertisements recur.

In a one-page preface, Professor Windley remarked that he "made no attempt to analyze or interpret the advertisements." He left to the reader "to decide what meaning they contain" and what they reveal as to "the minds of the slaveowners." Windley did note that Lorenzo J. Greene, in his study of "the New England Negro as Seen in Advertisements for Runaway Slaves," (*Journal of Negro History,* April, 1944) had called attention to "the bonanza of information" available in such sources.

In addition to the early Greene study (which dealt with only sixty-two advertisements), Windley in his dissertation noted the work of G. W. Mullin, *Flight and Rebellion: Slave Resistance in Eighteenth Century Virginia,*[9] which analyzed about 1,500 advertisements in the *Virginia Gazette* from 1736 to 1801. This work, however, concentrated on Mullin's ideas about "acculturation." Windley thought Mullin made "too many assumptions" and that his work suffered from "a lack of data to substantiate his many hypotheses." I agree with this estimate, but add that the Mullin book does supplement other work—including Windley's—on aspects of slave resistance.

Windley quite rightly spends little time dismissing the racist work of Phillips and the simply poorly informed though profoundly opinionated effort of Stanley Elkins.

Not available to Windley when he wrote his dissertation were

recent studies that offer supplementary and confirmatory data. These include Daniel E. Meaders' study of 2,002 runaway slaves of South Carolina as reported in newspapers from 1732 to 1801 (*Journal of Negro History,* 1975) and in the already noted essay by Michael P. Johnson. Also consequential is Peter Wood's *Black Majesty: Negroes in South Carolina from 1670 through the Stono Rebellion.*[10]

Windley's dissertation offered, in his words, "a review of legislation pertaining to fugitive slaves to show that the problem was a real one" and a "profile of runaway slaves" in the areas and time span covered. It summarized the contents of the advertisements in terms of their descriptions of the fugitives, their "degree of acculturation," including their occupations and avocations, their demeanors, and details of their actual flights—when, where, probable destinations, what fugitives carried with them. A final chapter traced the development of the fugitive slave clause in the original Constitution.

In the dissertation, Windley counted 1,276 fugitives from Virginia and 2,424 from South Carolina; his figures excluded children under the age of ten. He made clear that these data by no means reflect the totality of the phenomenon of slave flight: newspaper files are not complete; masters tended to place ads only when slaves were missing for many days or even months; papers were published in the few urban centers of the period so that plantations relatively near such centers tended to be main sources of advertisements.

Windley added that, in any case, data which appear in family papers, in petitions and in many other forms of records show that "For certain not every slaveowner advertised for his runaways." But Windley stated—and it seems impossible to disagree with him—that there is no way to even guess at the percentage of total runaways that the advertisements do represent. We know only that the problem of flight, for the masters, was certainly greater—probably much greater—than the many advertisements they placed would indicate.[11]

In summarizing the laws about slave flight in both the colonial and national periods, Windley noted provisions for lashing, dismembering, castrating, and executing. Branding, which was very common, was also provided for by law, as were the slitting of noses and the cutting off of ears. Windley quoted Thad W. Tate, Jr.'s, *The Negro in Eighteenth Century Williamsburg:* "dismemberment was a favorite punishment for the slave who continually ran away . . . the dismemberment usually took the form of cutting off a foot."[12] Descriptions in advertisements—as the four-volume collection amply demonstrates—prove dismemberment to have recurred.

Windley found that for Virginia and South Carolina, over the

cited period, the ratio of male to female among slave fugitives was four to one; no doubt, the main inhibitor for women was the responsibility for and devotion to children, and physically speaking, the great difficulty of successful flight with children. Most of those who fled were relatively young; Windley calculated the average age at 26.5 years.

The dissertation documented the well-known fact that, for obvious reasons, the years of the Revolution saw an enormous increase in the number of fugitives. Here tens of thousands were involved since mass flight often occurred; certainly, for this period, advertisements represented the tip of the iceberg.

One of the most frightful features of the effort at dehumanization by the slaveowners was the practice of branding their slaves—either with their full last names or with their initials. It appears that this was done routinely; additionally, chronic runaways would be branded with the letter "R." These brands appeared on men and women, and on various parts of the anatomy from the forehead to the hand; favorite sites seem to have been the buttocks and the breasts. M. B. Hamer wrote truthfully back in 1940: "Masters burned their initials [and more] into African flesh."[13]

In his dissertation, Windley observed that fugitives often were "harboured"; sometimes this was done by free Blacks and quite often by whites. Some of the latter were moved, as his four-volume collection shows, by antipathy for slavery. The main cause, however, for this widespread practice—especially in the early years of slavery (up to about 1790)—was the acute shortage of available labor. Windley noted that, in particular, "Captains of undermanned crews would often use slave labor in exchange for free passage." Laws severely punished this practice; South Carolina actually made it a capital offense.

The dissertation also added data to the history of outlying slaves and maroons within the present limits of the United States; of course, the four-volume collection adds further details. In addition to observing the ubiquitousness of the maroon phenomenon,[14] details occasionally appeared in the dissertation. Thus, Thomas Pinckney, the Governor of South Carolina, directed Colonel A. Vanderhorst of the state militia to undertake the capture and/or the destruction of outlying slaves, since, as he wrote on August 8, 1787, he had "received information that a party of runaway negro men, many of whom are armed, are being very troublesome to the plantations in the vicinity of Stono, and it being represented that they are too numerous to be quelled by the usual parties of patrol."

Windley, with abundant reason and restraint, concluded his dissertation by affirming that the evidence showed the slaves "were

not happy" and that they "exerted much effort to rid themselves of their bondage."

Analyzing the four documentary volumes we find: in volume one—which details Virginia up to page 432—there are advertisements for a total of 1,568 fugitives, of whom 184 are women (six are stated to be pregnant). Seventeen are noted as being children below the age of ten; the remainder, 1,367, are men. Included in these totals are one woman described as a free Negro, one Indian woman slave, one Indian man slave, and seven white male indentured servants.

In the remainder of this first volume (pp. 433–68), dealing with North Carolina (where the population then was quite sparse and extant newspapers relatively few) there are advertisements for a total of 105 fugitives, of whom one was a child, thirteen were women (one described as pregnant) and ninety-one were men.

All 437 pages of volume two are devoted to Maryland. Here the count of fugitives being sought by advertisements came to 1,290; of these, 134 were Afro-American women (four described as pregnant), eleven were children, and thirty were white indentured servants. This means that a total of 1,115 Afro-American men were advertised for in the stated period in Maryland.

All 778 pages of the third volume are devoted to South Carolina. The total number of fugitives sought in these advertisements came to 3,746; of these, 698 were women (fourteen listed as pregnant) and 122 were children. This left a total of 2,926 Afro-American men advertised for as fugitive slaves in South Carolina from 1732 through 1790.

The 198 pages of volume four reprint advertisements from the few extant newspapers in Georgia, where slavery was illegal until 1750 and population quite sparse until the nineteenth century. Still, in Georgia, from the first available advertisement in 1763 through 1790, a total of 1,242 people were advertised for as fugitives. Of these 229 were women (one was pregnant; one was Indian) and sixty-four were children, including eight specifically noted as being infants. This leaves a total of 940 Black men as being sought as fugitives in Georgia during the stated period. (Readers are reminded that Windley eliminated duplications in reprinting advertisements so that all figures contain no repetitions.)

The overall totals for the five areas through 1798 are: Men, 6,373; women, 1,258; children (under ten), 215, or *altogether a total of 7,846 human beings advertised for as fugitives.*

Striking in the advertisements is the frequency with which the master asserts that the slave or slaves fled in the company of white

people. This is especially true in the earlier period—until about 1750. In the past, several scholars, including W. E. B. Du Bois, James Hugo Johnston, Edmund S. Morgan, and the present writer, have called attention to the fact (still muted in the predominant literature) that Black-white unity, including intermarriage, was not uncommon, especially in the first three or four generations of slavery. These documentary volumes offer significant confirmation of this reality.

Thus, simply to illustrate, on pages three through ten of the first volume, seven different advertisements, from the years 1736–1739, call attention, in five cases, to a Black slave and a white servant fleeing together; in still another, three white servants and an Afro-American have fled together.

These kinds of advertisements recur throughout the volumes, and occasionally the white person is named. Thus, an ad from Hanover County, Virginia in 1751 states the fugitive "is suppos'd to be in Company with one Mary Marshall, an Irish woman."[15] Another case, from Maryland, shows one B. J. Worthington, M.D., advertising for David in 1789; the ad includes this sentence: "From this connection with a certain Nell Hazellep, living on South river, near the Land of Ease, I have every reason to believe she has induced him to take this trip, and I think it probable he is now secreted by her." (II, 180)

The frequency of flight by groups of slaves was noteworthy. Confining ourselves to a group made up of a *minimum of three adults* fleeing together, the four volumes yield a total of 329 such attempts. There were, indeed, twenty-nine advertisements for groups of seven or more adult slaves fleeing together; the largest number advertised for as fleeing together (late in the slave epoch, masters referred to mass flights of slaves as "stampedes") came to the astonishing total of thirty-six. The latter disaster befell Benjamin Edings who advertised in the "Royal Georgia Gazette," January 25, 1781, that thirty-six of his slaves—twelve of them women—had fled his plantation on Edisto Island, Georgia sometime around mid-June 1779. He named each but gave no further identification. Mr. Edings offered not only to meet "every reasonable expense" involved in capturing these fugitives but, in addition, to pay a reward of three guineas for each. He added: "Any of the above Negroes returning home of their own accord will be forgiven"—but, since they had been gone a year and a half, this postscript appears almost pathetically optimistic! (IV, 85)

When one moves into the area of collective flights of slaves reaching into numbers like ten or twenty, not to speak of thirty-six, one is entering a gray area where absconding moves into conspiracy

or even insurrection. Indeed, I have chosen to emphasize flights together of three of more slaves because any collective activity of more than two slaves—without participation or permission of the owner—was especially worrisome to the slaveowning class. Thus, New York declared, in 1702, that over three slaves were not to meet together for any reason whatsoever outside of their master's service; Boston in 1723 made illegal the gathering of two or more slaves, unless in the master's service, while the state of Texas defined an insurrection of slaves as "an assemblage of three or more, with arms, with intent to obtain their liberty by force."[16]

The slaveowner's most awful nightmare, of course, was an uprising. Naturally, then, the possession of arms of any kind by slaves was strictly forbidden by law and by practice. In view of this, added meaning appears in the fairly frequent notices in the advertisements that the slaves had taken weapons with them—as well as horses. To illustrate: three owners published a joint advertisement, out of Accomack County, Virginia, in 1751, stating that seven of their slaves (including two women) had absconded: "They are armed with Guns, etc., and have broked open several houses in the said County, committed Felonies, have taken a canoe, and 'tis imagined will take the first larger vessel they meet with, in order to cross the Bay." By Virginia law, these seven were insurrectionists; not simply fugitives. (I, 21–22)

From Goochland County, Virginia, that same year, a slave was advertised for who "had on his neck when he went away an Iron Collar, and took with him a Gun." From Stafford County, in Virginia, 1766, another fugitive "took a gun with him." Peter of Charles City County, also in Virginia, had fled in 1769; he "carried away a gun of uncommon large size, and a fiddle." This Peter, declared his owner, was already outlawed;[17] therefore he offered forty shillings if he was brought in alive and ten pounds if his head—"separate from his body"—were delivered. (I, 69)

The above are offered as examples; the presence of one or more guns (and other weapons, such as swords) is a recurrent feature of advertisements. Also commented upon with some regularity is the likelihood that the fugitive(s) had joined other comrades in some swamp—this referred to the maroon phenomenon, already noticed, which characterized all slave areas and the entire epoch of slavery in the United States, as well, of course, as throughout Latin America.

One also finds, occasionally, specific references to the resort to violence by some among the fugitives, or involvement in insurrectionary activities. Thus, an ad tells us that from Prince George

County, Virginia, in 1767, two brothers with their mother fled. One among them, named Jupiter, alias Gibb, was described as six feet tall, thirty-five years old with "several scars on his back from a severe whipping he lately had at Sussex court-house, having been tried there for stirring up the Negroes to an insurrection."[18](I, 56)

Again, Robert Munford of Mecklenburg County, Virginia, reported the flight, in April 1766, of Jack who "has been principally concerned in promoting the late disorderly meetings among Negroes." Jack was short and bow-legged and "has been branded on the right cheek R and on the left M"—the former indicating a history of absconding and the latter being the owner's initial. (I, 42)

Burton fled a plantation in Isle of Wight, Virginia, in April 1771; he had already been outlawed. After having been "taken up some time ago" Burton made his escape this time "by cutting his overseer in several places with a knife." Twenty shillings were offered for his return. Another slave named Mann, fifty years old, fled a plantation in Northumberland County, Virginia early in 1769: "He is outlawed from his threatening to burn my houses," declared the owner who offered forty shillings for Mann alive and ten pounds for his head. (I, 94, 284) There are other instances of physical assaults upon overseers, drivers, or the homes of owners prior to flight.[19]

These advertisements may be considered as so many letters from one slaveowner to another. Their accuracy may be assumed and they possess no special pleading; they manifest an absence of self-consciousness and all in all are among the best possible sources of information for historians.

These hundreds of advertisements from all the main areas of slavery from a period of about sixty years depict realities of that institution viewed only by the owners unadorned with moonlight, magnolias, or molasses.

The advertisements are filled with evidences of the basic brutality of slavery, insofar as that brutality left physical marks. Here are *representative* examples: "is scarrified by whipping" (I, 34); "had on, when he went away, an iron collar about his neck" (I, 35); "he has been severely whipped, from which he bears intolerable marks all over his body" (I, 60); "severe whippings which his back will show" (I, 219); "much scarrified on his back with whipping" (I, 329); "has many scars about her neck and breast, her back will prove her to be an old offender . . . has lost a piece of one of her ears" announced the gallant Leighton Woods, Jr. of Virginia describing twenty-seven year old Kate (I, 340); the ears of this runaway "for his bad actions have been slit about half an inch at the tip." (I, 458); this one fled despite seven or eight pound clogs on his legs

(III, 225); this one had "his nose slitted and both ears cropped" (III, 283); this one had an iron hoop around her eighteen-year old neck (III, 406); this one carried the full name of the owner branded between her breasts (IV, 137); and this one had fled despite a fourteen pound clog of iron on one leg (III, 539).

From a South Carolina plantation in 1757 fled one Jack, about thirty-five years old, "middle sized Angola man" who "may be easily known upon close examination being castrated." (III, 153) William Payne of Baltimore reported, in October 1766, the flight a month earlier of "a Negro girl, named Hagar, about 14 Years of Age" who "has a scar under one of her breasts, supposed to be got by a Whipping . . . an Iron Collar about her neck." This girl "is suppos'd to be harbour'd in some Negro Quarter, as her Father and Mother encourages her in Elopements, under a Pretence that she is ill used at Home." (II, 67)

Edward Dyer of Prince George's County in Maryland advertised in August 1767, the flight—a year earlier—of "a Negro Lad, named Dick, about 17 years of Age." This Dick "is notorious for running away, having constantly practiced it since he was six years of age, in return for which he has received two remarkable certificates; the first, Stripes, by whipping; the other, having a letter D branded on his A-se." (II, 70) Readers will observe the splendid delicacy of the distinguished Mr. Dyer.

The scars and brands and clogs and iron collars are the silent speeches of the slaves; sometimes, advertisers made the objects of their search more articulate. Here are a couple of instances: Joshua Eden of Charles Town, South Carolina, reported the flight on November 4, 1775 of his slave "a Negro Man, named Limus." He was "of a yellow complexion, and has the ends of three of his fingers cut off his left hand." This Limus, the ad continued, "is well known in Charles Town from his saucy and impudent tongue, of which I have had many complaints; therefore," continued the ad, "I hereby give Liberty and will be also much obliged to any Person to flog him (so as not take his life) in such Manner as they shall think proper, whenever he is found out of my Habitation without a ticket." But that is not the end of this advertisement. The owner went on that "though he is my Property, he has the audacity to tell me, he will be free, that he will serve no Man, and that he will be conquered or governed by no Man." (III, 345)

John Fisher was another master in Charles Town who had similar trouble. This involved "a young negro fellow named Quamina" who was "well-known in and about the city by his impudent behaviour." Indeed, the master went on, this Quamina "has told me to my face, 'he can go when he pleases, and I can do nothing to him,

nor shall I ever get a copper for him.' " Fisher offered two guineas for his capture and added in a postscript that Quamina was seventeen years old and "a carver and chair maker by trade." (III, 577)

Some of the advertisements are veritable scripts for a play; in one case, the very characters had a Shakespearean turn. Thus Austin Brockenbrough of Westmoreland, Virginia, on January 13, 1789, advertised the flight, the previous September 2, of "a likely negro man slave, named ROMEO, five feet six inches high, and well proportioned . . . when he walks he holds himself erect . . . generally appears thoughtful and seldom seen to laugh; is fond of prescribing and administering to sick negroes . . . he reads, writes, and knows something of figures, and for some time before his departure had exercised his talents *in giving passes and certificates of freedom to runaway slaves* [italics added—H.A.]; but made his escape a few days before the detection."

Of this Romeo "it is believed that a small black girl named Juliet, (belonging to Benoni Williams of Spotsylvania) is with him. . . . It is likely he may steer his course towards Amelia, as he has several very near relations . . . in that county." (I, 404)

Somewhat unusual was the flight of women alone, but it did occur. An example, from South Carolina, dated August 11, 1785, shows one Charles H. Simons of Charlestown announcing the flight of "THREE NEGRO WENCHES viz. JENNY, an elderly short wench; DIDO her daughter about 35 years of age, middle stature; and TISSEY, her granddaughter with a young child at her breast." (III, 391)

Thomas Johnston, administrator of the estate of Benjamin Wilson of Savannah, Georgia, announced that six adult slaves had fled the latter's plantation early in May 1790. Four of these were men, two were women. Among the latter was Sue, about thirty-five years old and quite short. She "is now and has been for a long time lame with the rheumatism, even to her finger ends." Nevertheless, it was Sue who had "carried her three children with her, viz. Juno, a girl of 10 years; Sarah, 7 years; and Dolly, 3 1/2 years old." (IV, 177)

James Cochran, also of Savannah, announced that five of his slaves—four of them women—had fled in mid-March 1788. The women— Sarah, Hannah, Nancy, and Grace—were in their twenties. One was missing a finger on her right hand; another, Nancy, fled despite "an iron put on her leg" for previous trespasses. (IV, 155)

There are instances of complaints from masters that certain escaped slaves have refused to acknowledge Anglicized names, persisting in answering only to their African names.[20] An instance comes from a Georgia advertisement, June 3, 1767, telling of the flight of

"TWO NEW NEGROE YOUNG FELLOWS." One thought to be about eighteen years of age came from the Fallah country; he had been named Abel but persisted on calling himself Golaga. The other "of the Suroga country" had been named Bennet but he answered only to Abbrom. (IV, 22)

More frequently noted in the ads are expressions of opinion from the masters that the fugitives intended to find their way back to Africa. Thus, George Robertson, whose plantation was near Petersburg, Virginia, affirmed that in mid-May 1771, two of his slaves fled. Both were what were called "new Negroes"—i.e., recently brought from Africa. One, a man named Step, was six feet tall, about twenty years of age, had lost many of his front teeth, had his country marks on his temples and "a very honest countenance." He fled with a girl, about twelve years old, named Lucy. "They went off with several others, being persuaded that they could find their way back to their own country." The group was attacked, several were retaken but not these two—who therefore were now outlawed. (I, 99)

Joseph Weatherly of Ogeechee, Georgia, announced that in November 1774, five of his slaves, including one woman, had fled. They seized a boat; the woman was caught but not the men; she said "the other negroes told her they intended to go to look for their own country." (III, 466)

David Williams, whose plantation named "Brotherhood" was located on the Great Pedee River in South Carolina, announced that five of the "brothers"—"of the Angola country"—had taken leave of Mr. Williams in mid-August 1769. The eldest was about forty-five years of age, the youngest about twenty-five. Said the advertiser: "they are supposed to have gone an East course as long as they could, thinking to return to their own country that way." (III, 651)

Recurring in the ads in all four volumes are evidences of Black-white helpfulness and/or statements by the advertisers directly "accusing" some whites of opposing slavery. Illustrations are in order: John Hook and William Terry of Bedford County, Virginia, announced the flight in September 1790 of two brothers, named Caesar and Jack, both in their twenties. Each was an excellent fiddler. And: "It is conjectured they are gone into the frontier country, either in Maryland or Pennsylvania, and may be harboured by free Negroes or by white persons who are enemies of slavery, and may think such a conduct warrantable." (II, 411)

James Parsons complained that five slaves had fled from his plantation at Ashepoo, South Carolina in the course of several months in 1762; he was convinced they disappeared into the service

of white people "in the back parts of the country" who require workers. The implication is that the fugitives thus gain freedom; in any case the illegal practice is sharply denounced. (III, 227)

Henry Gibbes of Georgetown, South Carolina, announced that four of his slaves had fled in January 1790; they were all men, and Gibbes suggested that the four were fleeing to areas (named) where they had wives. Most fascinating is this ad's conclusion:

> As the subscriber has some reason to suspect that there are despicable characters in the city who harbor and encourage the desertion of negroes from their owners, and by furnishing them with tickets in their master's names, render their recovery extremely difficult, a reward of TWENTY POUNDS will be given on the conviction of such person, if white, and TEN POUNDS if proved to be harboured by a mulatto or Black. (III, 411)

What may well have been a kind of John Brown seems to have troubled slaveowners in St. Andrew's Parish of South Carolina in the 1760s. Here is the full text—lengthy though it is—of an ad signed by Thomas Fuller and dated in that Parish, August 11, 1767:

> Whereas JONATHAN MACCONNELL, an Irish man, of a dark or brown complexion, wears a short brown wig, is about 6 feet high, and well made, did on Sunday night, August 9 instant, leave the plantation belonging to the estate of Benjamin Fuller, and carried off with him THREE NEGROES, viz. a negro man named WILL, stout and well made, very black, aged about 23 years, another negro man named JOHN, likely and pretty stout made, very black, aged bout 19 or 20 years; and a boy about 14 or 15 years old, named JOE, not so black as the fellows; all of them born in this country, and speak very good English; and it being likewise imagined that he has carried off several other slaves, viz. a negro man of Mrs. Catherine Cattell's, a negro man belonging to John Ainslie, Esq; and also another man called CAIN, *all of them being armed* [italics added—H.A.]; it is supposed the said MacConnell will endeavour to make his escape with the said negroes out of the province, or at least to the back parts thereof; he also carried off with him a small bay stallion. ONE HUNDRED POUNDS REWARD will be given to any person or persons that will apprehend the said Jonathan MacConnell, and deliver him to the common gaol in Charlestown, to be paid on conviction; TWENTY POUNDS a head for Will and John, TEN

POUNDS for the boy, and a handsome gratuity for the horse. (III, 421)

The practice of back-country folk (and ships' captains) employing fugitive slaves has been noted earlier. It was widely lamented by slaveowners. Here, for instance, is the language in an ad from Robert Dearington of South Carolina, announcing the flight of three male slaves in May 1766: "And as it is a customary thing for the back settlers of this province, to take up new negroes, and keep them employed privately, and in order to bring such offenders to justice, I hereby offer a Reward of Fifty Pounds on conviction of said negroes being harboured by white people, and Ten, if by a negro." (III. 604–05)

John Vauchier of South Carolina in March 1769, described a twenty-year old male slave who had fled from him (branded on both shoulders and breast) who "had had his irons struck off by a villain who went in these parts by the name of GOSDON." (III, 643)

From Savannah, Georgia in October 1780 came a plea from John Rose for the apprehension of three male slaves, three female—one of the latter a girl of fifteen. One of the women, Phebe, "has five children with her, one of them at the breast"; the other, Juno, had two children with her. The ad closes by affirming the likelihood that these fugitives were being helped by either white or Black people and "It is hoped so scandalous a practice will be discountenanced by all well wishers to the community, by discovering the persons concerned in such practices. . . ." (IV, 81)

One finds also advertisments which are more specific as to the possible "culprits." Thus, Samuel Iverson in Georgia announced on New Year's Day 1789, that a slave named Isaac had fled and "it is supposed he is harboured by some white person, as he has been encouraged in making his escape by one Clark, a waggoner or barber." (IV, 162)

Similarly, Tom, twenty-nine years old, fled in Rockingham County, Virginia in August 1786; he took much clothing with him and a shot gun with ammunition. And: "went away with him a white man, who called himself Elijah Gardner" for whose apprehension a reward of five pounds was offered. (I, 388)

Occasionally cryptic references would seem to refer to a widespread condition of white sympathy with slaves. For instance, George Watts of St. Mary's County, Maryland, advertised the flight of a male slave in September 1765. According to Mr. Watts, this escapee—Tom—is "a great Rogue and very artful." Hence, the ad writer went on, "I imagine he had got a forged pass, as he has

been concerned with some white people of the same Stamp." (II, 63) Similar expressions recur among the advertisements; here are some examples taken from one of the volumes: One Abidnigo Hyatt advertised in the *Annapolis Maryland Gazette* June 15, 1775, that "a lusty negro woman named Rhoad, now goes by the name of Nancy Bannaker, [a famous name, of course, in Black Maryland history]" fled on April 15 together with "an Irish servant." In the same issue of that paper, one John Ashton offered a reward of six pounds for the capture of "a mulatto fellow named Tom, a shoemaker by trade" who was twenty-one years old "and discovers a great deal of assurance and impudence in his conversation." The slaveowner thought it likely that this impudent one "may call himself free, and have a forged pass under another name" and that he may "be concealed . . . in the neighbourhood of Bellair, on Patuxent, where he lived, by some white people, who make too familiar with my slaves to my great prejudice." (II, 111–112)

In the Baltimore, Maryland *Journal and Advertiser* of February 6, 1781, Barbara Williams offered a reward of four thousand (war-inflated) dollars for the capture of "a white mulatto slave" who was thirty-one years old and a carpenter, named Leonard. The remainder of the ad deserves quotation in full:

> He was persuaded off by a white woman, who calls herself Rachel Dorsey, and says that, about 8 or 9 years ago, she left Pennsylvania. It appears that she had two children by the above slave, both boys, the eldest named Samuel, about five years of age; the other named Basil, two years of age. It is supposed they will pass for man and wife, and make for Pennsylvania, or the Eastern Shore. (II, 245)

In the same paper, of September 13, 1785, Raphael Boarman advertised for the capture of "a tawney woman, about 20 years old, of middle size, long, curly hair" who, it was thought, had been led astray "by a white man, who has been very intimate with her for some years." (II, 335)

A striking feature of these eighteenth century advertisements is the proof they offer that many of the great families of the South in the colonial, revolutionary and early years of the Republic were not spared the flight of their slaves. Thus: In the *South-Carolina Gazette,* February 2–9, 1734, one finds: "run away from HIS EXCELLENCY, the Governor, a Negro Man, named Prince, His Excellency's Coachman: Whatever white man or Negro shall take him alive or dead shall have five pounds reward." (III, 8) Very near the beginning of 1735, His Excellency again had runaway problems. In

the above newspaper for January 18–25, 1735, one reads: "run away from His Excellency the Governor about 14 days ago, a young Negro Wench, about 14 or 15 years of age, very black of colour, a flattish face, had a negro cloth gown dyed yellowish, and a white handkerchief about her head, her name Phillis: Whoever brings her to the Governor's House shall be rewarded as the law directs, and whoever harbours or conceals her shall be prosecuted." (III, 12–13)

In the same newspaper, February 8–15, 1768, Richard Lambton, acting for the Governor of Georgia, announced that the latter had suffered the loss of three of his slaves in October 1767. They were aged twenty, thirty, and forty years respectively; the youngest was born in South Carolina but the other two were imported from Angola and Guinea. Only the skill of the eldest was noted—he was "a very good sawyer." Five pounds sterling were offered for each, and anyone guilty of harboring them "may depend on being prosecuted with the utmost severity."(III, 269)

Joseph Weatherly, acting for the same governor of Georgia, placed an ad in the Savannah *Georgia Gazette*, December 13, 1769, announcing that three slaves had left his plantation near Savannah the preceding October. They were from the Guinea country and were named Pitt, Pompey, and Carlos but spoke almost no English. They were, however, "all very likely young fellows" and a reward of twenty shillings, each, "over and above what is allowed by law" was offered. (IV, 41–42)

Among the great names of Georgia history is that of the Troup family, George M. being its governor (1823–1827) and twice its U.S. Senator (1816–1818; 1829–1833). His father, George Troup, advertised in the Savannah *Gazette of the State of Georgia*, January 6, 1785, that five slaves—one a woman of forty years—had recently fled from his plantation. The eldest, Brutus, was over forty, stood six feet high and "wants his fore teeth and is much wrinkled." (IV, 121)

Perhaps more noted in Georgia history than the Troups were the Habershams. James (1713–1775) was the royal governor of Georgia, but his son Joseph was a leading Revolutionary, supported the ratification of the Constitution and served for a time as Postmaster-General (1795–1801). Joseph's brother, James, advertised in the same newspaper cited above, August 4, 1785, of the flight of three slaves from his plantation at Little Ogechee. He noted that all three had been taken up in flight but had made their escape again and were now "at Large." A reward of twenty dollars was offered for the return of any one of them. (IV, 132)

In the history of South Carolina no family is better known than the Pinckneys—with Charles, Charles C., and Thomas, all eighteenth

and early nineteenth century figures holding very high offices in state and federal politics and in diplomacy. The family is well represented, too, among those signing advertisements for runaway slaves. Colonel William Pinckney suffered the disaster of the simultaneous flight in November 1756, of six male slaves; he advertised for them in the *South-Carolina Gazette,* December 30, 1756.

Elizabeth Pinckney advertised in the same paper, December 10–17, 1763, that three male slaves had fled her plantation "about 6 months past"; five pounds were offered for the return of each. Roger Pinckney, in the same paper, October 31, 1774, stated that two newly-imported slaves, a man of nineteen named Brutus and a woman of twenty, named Belinda, had fled from his plantation in St. Andrew's Parish. They had been part of what amounted to a conspiracy for "they went away with five or six Wenches, of the same Cargo, belonging to Mr. Thomas Eveleigh. . . ." (III, 342)

Of the family of Hugh S. Legaré, founder of the *Southern Review* and later an Attorney General and a Secretary of State, was Thomas Legaré, Jr. In the Charleston *South-Carolina and American General Gazette,* August 13, 1778, this Thomas announced the flight of three male slaves, the preceding July. These men, Sam, Joe, and March, had been captured while in flight but made their escape again. Twenty dollars were offered as a reward for the re-taking of Sam, a carpenter, and ten dollars for each of the other two. (III, 540)

No one is more consequential in the history of Maryland than Charles Carroll, known as Charles Carroll of Carrollton (1737–1832), member of the Continental Congress and United States Senator (1789–1792) and perhaps Maryland's richest planter. In the Annapolis *Maryland Gazette* of December 16, 1773, appears his advertisement for "a young mulatto woman, called Moll or Polly, about twenty-three years of age, thin and low in stature." The person who captured Moll or Polly "shall be handsomely rewarded," declared Charles Carroll of Carrollton. (II, 103)

Of a status like that of Carroll was his fellow Marylander, Samuel Chase (1741–1811), a leading figure in the Revolution, a Signer of the Declaration of Independence and Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court (1798–1811). There is an ad in the Annapolis *Maryland Gazette,* October 13, 1780, wherein a reward of $400 is offered for the capture of Bet, a twenty-five year old woman, of "small stature." "Whoever takes her up," the ad went on, "and brings her to Samuel Chase, Esq., at Annapolis, or gives

notice of her to him so that she may be had, shall receive the above reward." (II, 128)

At least the equal in historical consequence to Carroll and Chase was Christopher Gadsden (1724–1805), of South Carolina, a wealthy planter, merchant, and a leader of the more radical wing of the Revolution, who, however, later opposed Jefferson. In the *South Carolina Gazette,* May 4–11, 1747, Mr. Gadsden advertised the flight of "a likely, tall and slim Mustee fellow named Mingo, about 20 years of age . . . a cooper by trade." A five pound reward, in addition to "lawful charges" would be paid for his return. In the same paper, August 6–13, 1750, Christopher Gadsden announced that Mingo—who had run away "about eighteen months since"—was thought "to conceal himself about Santee or Winyaw." But now another slave had fled, "about six or seven weeks ago" named Scipio and he was "a lusty, surly looking fellow." The reward now for either "of these fellows" was lifted to twenty pounds. (III, 76, 100–101)

Rivaling Carroll, Chase, and Gadsden in historic consequence was Henry Laurens (1724–1792), another very wealthy merchant and planter of South Carolina. He not only was a member of the Continental Congress, but served as its president for a time (1777–1778). He was part of the team that negotiated the Treaty of Paris (1783) terminating the Revolution. (It may be added that Laurens was one of the few Southern leaders of the Revolution who favored the use of Afro-Americans as soldiers in the war.)

In the *South Carolina Gazette* of September 27, 1773, he announced the flight—a year earlier—of three African-born male slaves, two from Mandingo and one from Guinea. The African names of all three were given, as well as the slave names, indicating very likely resistance by the slave in accepting the latter. Twenty pounds reward for each was offered. (III, 329–30; the same ad was run in the Savannah *Georgia Gazette,* January 5, 1774, IV, 46)

Standing with Gadsden and Laurens among early South Carolina luminaries is Rawlins Lowndes (1721–1800), Speaker of the colonial assembly, a judge in the colonial period, and main drafter of the State's first constitution. In the *South Carolina Gazette* of June 9, 1757, Rawlins Lowndes signed this ad:

> Runaway about a month ago from the subscriber's plantation at Goose Creek, a tall slender New Gambia negro fellow, about 20 years of age, carried shackles about his legs, (which he may probably have gotten off) has a large scar behind one of his shoulders occasioned by fire when he was young and a scar on

> his throat that has raised the flesh. Whoever apprehends the said fellow, and delivers him to me in Charles-town, or at the said plantation, shall have 5 pounds reward. (III, 154)

This same Mr. Lowndes advertised in the same paper, January 30, 1770, for the return of "a mustee young fellow, named Prince" who was a painter by trade; again five pounds reward was offered. (III, 653)

Few are the renowned family names of early Virginia history which do not mark the roll of dismay, determination and dishonor compiled by the late Dr. Windley. Very near the most illustrious among the illustrious Virginians of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were the members of the numerous Randolph family. John Randolph, father of Edmund Randolph (Governor of Virginia, 1786–1788 and the first Attorney General of the United States), was himself a Tory and with the outbreak of the Revolution went to England. This founder of a line of eminent statesmen placed the following ad in the *Virginia Gazette,* November 2, 1769:

> RUN away from the subscriber, two Negro men, viz. SAM, about 30 years of age, branded on his cheek R. AARON, about 21 years of age, has been branded with the same brand, as Sam, but it is almost worn out. They are both of a lowerish complexion. Whoever apprehends the said Negroes, and brings them to me in Amelia, or to Henry Randoph in Chesterfield, shall have 5 pounds reward. (I, 74)

A week later the same newspaper carried an ad signed by Carter Braxton (1736–1797), member of the Continental Congress for ten years beginning in 1775 and one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. This later-day Signer, signed an ad announcing that in November 1769, two of his slaves, Dick and Moses, fled from his plantation in King William County. He thought the fugitives were on their way to North Carolina; a reward of ten pounds for each was offered by Braxton. (I, 75) Earlier, this Carter Braxton had placed in the *Virginia Gazette,* July 28, 1768, a brief advertisement:

> RUN away from the subscriber, the 10th of June last, a Negro fellow named CAJAH, about 5 feet 9 inches high, of a yellow complexion, a downcast look, well made, a very slovenly fellow, his voice sounds as if coming out of a hollow tree, and reads and writes very well. I am apprehensive he will endeavour to make his escape from the colony. Whoever

brings him to me, in King William County, shall be well rewarded. (I, 61)

Edward Ruffin of Prince George County—grandfather of the fire-eater of the same name (1795–1865) whose ideological leadership of secession was recognized when he was given the honor of firing the first round at Fort Sumter commencing the Civil War—placed an ad in the *Virginia Gazette* of January 5, 1776, announcing that four of his slaves had fled together on November 26, 1775. They had been part of a group of six runaways; two had been retaken. Ruffin thought the four were headed for the British (Cornwallis had promised freedom for adult male slaves of rebels who reached his lines). One of the four was "of the Indian breed"; they were carpenters and wheelwrights, ranging in age from eighteen to thirty. They had made their escape in a yawl; Ruffin offered a reward of five pounds for the return of each of two named and forty shillings for each of the remaining two. Ominously he added: "They are all outlawed." (I, 334)

Benjamin Harrison (1726?–1791) was a member of the Continental Congress, a Governor of Virginia (1781–1784) and a Signer of the Declaration of Independence—and a father and grandfather of Presidents of the United States. He had repeated difficulty with the flight of slaves. In the *Virginia Gazette*, October 6, 1770, Harrison announced the flight of "a mullatto man named Nick" who was short and twenty-two years of age with a scar over one of his eyes. Harrison thought he would stop at a plantation where he was known to have a wife; five pounds were offered for his capture. And in the *Virginia Gazette* or *American Advertiser* of April 16, 1785, still another slave who had fled the Signer was advertised for—a twenty-two year old who was well proportioned and also had a scar on his face and who was known to have a wife in Richmond where perhaps he was skulking. Two guineas were offered to the person who captured him. (I, 29–30, 86, 374)

George Mason (1725–1792), chief author of Virginia's Declaration of Rights and identified especially with the adoption of the Bill of Rights, had problems with fugitive slaves. In the Annapolis *Maryland Gazette*, October 5, 1786, he and his son, George, Jr., announced the flight late in September from their plantation in Fairfax County, Virginia, of two slaves, Dick and Watt. The first was twenty-five years of age, the second thirty-five; they carried away with them a very large assortment of clothing. Watt "has had cross paths lately shaved on his head to conceal which it is probable he will shave or cut close the rest of his head." The Masons thought, "They will perhaps change their names and pass

for free men, and it is probable they may have a forged pass." They offered a reward of ten pounds for both. (II, 163–64)

James Madison, Father of the Constitution and fourth President of the United States, wrote—in addition to the Constitution—a notice of the flight of a fugitive slave in the *Virginia Gazette* of *American Advertiser,* November 22, 1786. This told of the flight on June 14, 1786, from the subscriber in Orange County, of seventeen-year old Anthony who was "well made, [and] has light hair and grey eyes." He was used as a house servant. Madison thought: "It is probable he has procured a pass, or a Certificate of his Freedom; and has changed his name and cloaths." (I, 389)

The former father-in-law of Martha (Mrs. George) Washington, John Custis, Esq., of Williamsburg, was obliged to report the flight of his slave named Peter, who was "about thirty years of age." The advertisement appears in the *Virginia Gazette,* May 2–9, 1745. This Peter "went away with Irons on his Legs" and was outlawed; which was fair warning that recapture might be difficult. (I, 11)

George Washington, himself, when a mere Colonel, seems to have been troubled by the flight of a slave. The advertisement is somewhat ambiguous but in the *Virginia Gazette* of May 7, 1772, one Joseph Crenshaw announces the flight of "a likely Virginia negro fellow named Peter." The reader is told that a reward of forty shillings will be paid if Peter is found within Virginia and five pounds if outside its borders and that he might be returned to Crenshaw himself, "or to Mr. Henry Gilbert in New Kent, at Colonel George Washington's plantations." (I, 114)

Other evidence that George Washington was bothered by a fugitive slave problem appears in a 1766 letter to Captain Josiah Thompson of the schooner "Swift," concerning one of his slaves he was sending to the West Indies as punishment. "Sir," wrote Washington,

> with this letter comes a Negro (Tom) which I beg the favor of you to sell, in any of the Islands you may go to, for whatever he will fetch, and bring me in return for him: 1 hogshead of best molasses; 1 ditto of best rum; 1 barrel of limes, if good and cheap; 1 pot of tamarinds containing about ten pounds; 2 small ditto of mixed sweet meats, about five pounds each. And the residue, much or little, in good old spirits.

Washington went on to explain the punishment: "This fellow is both a rogue and a runaway (though he was by no means remarkable for the former and never practiced the latter until recently) I shall

not pretend to deny." But Tom was, Washington continued, "exceedingly strong and healthy, and good at the hoe" and this—together with seeing that Tom was "trimmed up a little when offered for sale"—should result in his "sell[ing] well." Washington closed by warning that it were best "to keep him [Tom] handcuffed till you get to sea."[21]

Peter Jefferson, Thomas's father, under date of Goochland, October 24, 1751, placed the following ad in the *Virginia Gazette*, November 7, 1751:

> RAN away from the subscriber's plantation, near Albemarle Court-House, some time in May last, a Negroe Man named Robin; he is a small fellow, about 30 years of age, speaks pretty good English, his legs are crooked; had on his Neck when he went away an Iron Collar and took with him a Gun. Whoever brings him to me shall be rewarded according to Law. (I, 23)

The author of the Declaration of Independence and the third President of the United States (who, like Washington, was the owner of over two hundred slaves at his death) placed this ad over his signature in the *Virginia Gazette*, September 14, 1769—one laments that it does not appear in any of his collected writings:

> RUN away from the subscriber in Albemarle, a Mulatto slave called Sandy, about 35 years of age, his stature is rather low, inclining to corpulence, and his complexion light; he is a shoemaker by trade, in which he uses his left hand principally, can do coarse carpenters work, and is something of a horse jockey; he is greatly addicted to drink, and when drunk is insolent and disorderly, in his conversation he swears much, and in his behaviour is artful and knavish. He took with him a white horse, much scarred with traces, of which it is expected he will endeavor to dispose; he also carried his shoemaker's tools, and will probably endeavor to get employment that way. Whoever conveys the said slave to me, in Albemarle, shall have 40 s. reward, if taken up within the county, 4 l. if else-where within the colony, and 10 l. if any other colony, from
>
> THOMAS JEFFERSON (I, 73)

Probably the wealthiest individual in colonial Virginia was Robert Carter, called "King" by his familiars. He possessed over one thousand slaves and some 300,000 acres of land. He had two sons, one of them named Landon who married into the Custis family and

accumulated property nearing the dimensions of his father's.[22] This Landon Carter—whom we may now call Prince—placed the following ad in the *Virginia Gazette* or *American Advertiser,* December 18, 1784; it fittingly concludes this record of infamy, irony—and resistance:

RAN AWAY

FROM my house in the county of King George, on the 24th ult. a negro man slave named GENERAL; he is a tailor by trade, very remarkable as a runaway having lost both his legs, cut off near his knees, which being defended by leather, serve him instead of feet. He is thick and square made in the body and arms, speaks readily, and without restraint, seeming to aim at a stile above that used generally by slaves, though something corrupt. I don't know his age, nor can guess at it, as he looks very much younger than he affects to be; his face is round, plump, and free from wrinkles. . . . I will give FIVE DOLLARS reward, beside what the law allows, provided the taker up do chastise him before he brings him home; and his ingratitude, and want of pretence to leave me, forces me to enjoin severity in the chastisement.

LANDON CARTER (I, 370–71)

General No-Legs confronting Prince Carter conveys the reality of Afro-American slavery.

NOTES

1. H. Aptheker, *American Negro Slave Revolts* [1943] (International Publishers: N.Y., 1983), p. 374.
2. Stanley M. Elkins, *Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual History,* 3rd edition (University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1976); Robert W. Fogel and Stanley Engerman, *Time on the Cross,* 2 vols. (Little, Brown: Boston, 1974); and Lillian Crété, *Daily Life in Louisiana,* 1815–1830 (Louisiana State University Press: Baton Rouge, 1982)
3. St. Clair Drake, *The Redemption of Africa and Black Religion* (The Third World Press: Chicago, 1975), 12–13.
4. Michael P. Johnson, "Runaway Slaves and the Slave Communities in South Carolina, 1799 to 1830," *William & Mary Quarterly,* 38 (July 1981), 418–41; James Oakes, *The Ruling*

Race: A History of American Slave Holders (Vintage Books: New York, 1983), 24.

5. Mary F. Berry and John W. Blassingame, *Long Memory: The Black Experience in America* (Oxford University Press: N.Y., 1982), 10–11.
6. Mr. Windley (1939–1982) was born in North Carolina, received degrees at North Carolina Central University and his doctorate at the University of Iowa. From 1963 to his tragically early death, Mr. Windley was on the faculty of Morgan State University. I am indebted to Professor Benjamin Quarles and, in particular, to the kindness of Mrs. Flossie W. Windley, for this information.
7. Lathan A. Windley, "A Profile of Runaway Slaves in Virginia and South Carolina from 1730 through 1787," (University of Iowa, 1974).
8. Lathan A. Windley, *Runaway Slave Advertisements: A Documentary History from the 1730s to 1790,* (Greenwood Press: Westport, CT, 1983).
9. G.W. Mullin, *Flight and Rebellion: Slave Resistance in Eighteenth Century Virginia,* (Oxford University Press: N.Y., 1972).
10. Peter Wood, *Black Majesty: Negroes in South Carolina from 1670 through the Stono Rebellion,* (Oxford University Press: N.Y., 1974).
11. Notice Michael P. Johnson's statement: "Obviously, many South Carolina slaves who ran away between 1799 and 1830 never appeared in newspaper advertisements"—cited work, p.419.
12. Thad W., Tate, Jr., "The Negro in Eighteenth Century Williamsburg" (1965), 177. Repeated offenders—often outlawed—were especially subject to dismemberment. Early in 1708, Robert Carter—a leading Virginia slaveowner—was empowered by a court to cut off the toes of "two incorrigible negroes named Bambarra Harry and Dinah"—see Edmund S. Morgan, "American Slavery, American Freedom" (1975), 313. Of course, the killing of slaves by masters, if provocation was sufficient, was provided for by law from the earliest time—see W.W. Hening, "Statutes of Virginia", vol. II (1669), 270.
13. M.B. Hamer, "A Century Before Manumission," *North Carolina Historical Review,* 17 (July 1940), 235.
14. On this, see H. Aptheker, "Slave Guerilla Warfare," in *To be Free* (International Publishers: N.Y., 1948), 11–30.
15. Lathan A. Windley, *Runaway Slave Advertisements from the 1730s to 1790,* I, 23. Throughout the remaining text, references to this work will be cited in the text in parentheses indicating

first the volume number followed by the page number.

16. Further details and citations for these regulations will be found in my *Negro Slave Revolts,* 72, 162, 178.
17. An outlaw typically was a fugitive who had been out for a prolonged period and was suspected of other illegal acts. The law required public condemnation of the rebel and if he or she still remained out, then the condemned one was subject to being killed without further ceremony with a reward for the killer if the head were produced. In the four volumes, notice of outlawry is very frequent. This was a remnant of medieval law and reflected outlawry by an absolute ruler.
18. This may be connected to the discovery in 1767 in the neighborhood of Alexandria, Virginia, of a conspiracy to rebel. Several overseers died from poisoning and a few slaves were hanged, possibly including one or more belonging to George Mason—future main author of the Bill of Rights. See this writer's slave revolt book, pp. 198–99.
19. For example, II, 106; III, 473; IV, 94.
20. See, John C. Inscoe, "Carolina Slave Names: An Index to Acculturation," *Journal of Southern History,* 44 (November 1983), 527–54.
21. James T. Flexner, *George Washington: Anguish and Farewell* (being volume 4 of his *George Washington*) (Little Brown: Boston, 1972), 113–14. Flexner did not cite the 1772 advertisement quoted above. In his chapter 12 of cited volume, Flexner traces with great sympathy Washington's growing sense of guilt concerning slavery.
22. For a description of the Carters and their relationship with the Byrds, Randolphs, Harrisons, and others, see Clifford Dowdey, *The Golden Age: A Climate for Greatness, Virginia 1732–1775* (Little, Brown: Boston, 1970).

THE ABOLITIONIST MOVEMENT

The Abolitionist movement in the United States was the second great revolutionary effort to succeed in our history—the first, of course, being that movement which resulted in the establishment of the nation. The Abolitionist movement had three interrelated purposes: 1) to abolish slavery immediately and without compensation to the owners; 2) to combat racism and racist practices in the North; 3) to assist the free Black population. Certainly the first goal was the basic one in the nineteenth century, but the other two were consciously part of the Movement and their historical treatment has been very meager.

Generally in the literature, the Abolitionist movement has been presented as a reform effort, with white people as inspirers, strategists and leaders. This is erroneous. The Abolitionist effort was a revolutionary one and therefore necessarily was a Black-white movement, for in the United States no democratic effort—let alone a revolutionary one—can be anything but a united struggle of people of all colors and ethnic origins. Furthermore, since the movement was especially concerned with the position of Black people, it naturally was those people who were its grand strategists, most effective tacticians, most persevering adherents and especially its pioneers.

The movement was a revolutionary one because it sought the overthrow of the ruling class—the ruling class not only in the South but also in the nation as a whole. Of course, the slaveowners utterly dominated the economics, ideology and politics of the South—though not without significant challenge from the slaves and, increasingly as the years rolled on, from the nonslaveholding whites. But that class, which numbered not more than about 175,000 at its high point in 1860, also constituted the greatest single economic interest in the nation as a whole prior to the Civil War. Their ownership of some 3,500,000 slaves worth perhaps three and a half billion dollars, plus their ownership of the cotton, tobacco, rice, sugar, hemp, lumber-products that they produced, and of the land which that labor made fruitful, plus the buildings and tools and animals, made of that interrelated, highly class-conscious oligarchy by far the greatest single vested interest in the nation as a

whole. Based upon that foundation, that class dominated both political parties—Democratic and Whig (while tending to favor the former)—and therefore dominated the Congress and the Presidency. It dominated the judiciary and its ideology was the ruling one not only in Mississippi but in the nation as a whole. That is, the major publishing houses would print nothing offensive to the slaveholding class, the major universities would not hire professors who condemned slavery and the leading newspapers of the nation—with extremely rare and partial exceptions—at least acquiesced in slavery's existence and excoriated the "fanatical" Abolitionists.

The Abolitionist movement, then, stood opposed to all of that; it was in principled opposition to the ruling class and the state and all its apparatus of persuasion, domination and coercion. That movement was revolutionary exactly in the sense that it sought the overthrow of the ruling class in the only way in which a ruling class can be overthrown; i.e., it sought the elimination of that form of private property the ownership of which defined that ruling class and gave it its power. The slaveowners were the ruling class and the Abolitionists sought the immediate, uncompensated abolition of slave property; nothing else could *end* slavery and nothing else could *terminate* the power of the slaveowners. That is not a reform movement; it is a revolutionary one.

The available literature is meager, too, on the *movement* feature of the Abolitionist struggle. Most of the available works—and especially the textbooks—give readers an impression of a rather formless, nebulous conglomeration of (generally white) people of benevolent feelings (or malevolent, if the author opposes Abolitionism, as many books still do) who somehow were able to stir up considerable commotion and influence significant political developments. The reality is otherwise. The Abolitionist movement was a *movement*; that is, it was highly organized on national, regional, state-wide, and local levels. In addition, it contained organizations of particular components of the population, as of women and of youth. It was served by a professional revolutionary cadre—men and women who devoted their entire lives to the movement; it held regular meetings and conventions, had formal constitutions and organs of agitation and propaganda. Its points of concentration and its campaigns did not simply "happen"; on the contrary, they were the results of collective and prolonged discussions and debates and on the basis of such efforts would be determined a policy of concentrating upon ending the domestic slave-trade, for example, or petitioning Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, or in the federal territories, or fighting in Massachusetts, for instance, to abolish jim-crow schools, or jim-crow transportation. In this way, there came into being—especially

among the Afro-American people, but always with white allies—vigilance committees and the underground railroad and major rescue attempts, which helped capture the attention of the nation and, indeed, of the world.

The Abolitionist movement, like all revolutionary efforts, had its inner struggles against opportunism, sectarianism and racial and sexual chauvinism. This movement, too, like all revolutionary movements, not only was Black-white but also reflected male and female joint struggle. Indeed it is reflective of the deeply revolutionary nature of the struggle to abolish slavery that it was exactly that movement which witnessed the first appearance of significant public participation by women and which in turn helped inspire the organized movement in the United States for the liberation of women.

The Abolitionist movement also was a basic component of the overall democratic struggle of humanity. That is, its effort to abolish slavery, its commitment to oppose racism, its male-female reality, all reflected a new definition of "people." When the Fathers of this Republic wrote "people" they had in mind what propertied white males of the eighteenth century had in mind by that word—i.e., people like themselves, and not people of other colors, and not women and not the propertyless. But the Abolitionist movement of the nineteenth century broadens the meaning of people; its usage is antielitist and antiracist and anti-male-chauvinist. When the Abolitionist movement sought freedom it sought freedom for the least among the people and therefore its blows were directed toward human emancipation.

Hence, too, one sees in the struggle against slavery a significant effort to preserve and extend freedom of press and speech and assembly and to oppose aggressive, expansionistic foreign policies emanating from Washington—as that which made war upon Mexico and threatened war upon Spain in order to annex Cuba.

Furthermore, this battle to abolish slavery is part of the whole history of the labor movement in this country and in the world. Most of the Black people labored as slaves—skilled and unskilled and not only in the field but also in the city and not only raising cotton but also digging coal and not only producing hemp but also making iron. In this very real sense, the Emancipation Proclamation and the XIII Amendment abolishing slavery are great documents in the history of the labor movement. This is at the heart of Marx's insistence that labor in a white skin cannot be free while labor in a black skin is branded. This is the point, negatively, in the insistence by the leading ideologists of the slaveholders—as George Fitzhugh, for example—that only slavery "solves" the class struggle for it

makes of the worker so much "capital" in the pockets of the owners.

Abolitionism struck at the heart of so-called "civilization" as envisaged from John Locke to John C. Calhoun; that is, government exists to secure private property and the security of that private ownership of the means of production is the fundamental function of the State. Our slaves, insisted their owners, belong to us by the same right and the same law and with the same justification that the land and the factories belong to you in the North. If on Monday, they warned, the flames of Abolition should light up our plantations and consume our property in slaves, then on Tuesday you had better watch out that the tenants on your lands do not treat you similarly and that on Wednesday the workers in your factories do not feel it is their turn to emulate the slaves and the landless farmers. Once yield the precedent in any form of property rights, and then the ownership of all private property is in jeopardy and its sanctity is vitiated. When that goes, there goes also the sacredness of contract and if that goes then what has become of "civilization"? This is why the proslavery propagandists insisted that the Abolitionists were communists and socialists as well as atheists and barbarians.

One of the essential purposes of the racism which bulwarked slavery was to hide this antielitist, basically revolutionary quality of Abolitionism.

Abolitionism, then, was part of the democratic, egalitarian, anti-elitist quality of the entire fabric of human history. Further, it was fundamental to the liberation of the Afro-American people and while that liberation is a basic part of the history of the United States and of the world, it also is a history in and of itself. In this sense, then, Abolitionism is part of the liberation struggles of the especially oppressed peoples and nationalities of the earth. In our country, because of the organic character of Black-white unity, one sees the merging of all these struggles; this is dramatized in the Civil War where the original avowed purpose of the salvation of the Union was only possible if there occurred the emancipation of the Black people—and the emancipation of the Black people in turn was only possible if one saved the Union. To save the Union it was necessary to end slavery; to end slavery it was necessary to save the Union.

Another feature of the revolutionary quality of the Abolitionist movement was its internationalism. The effort to end slavery in the United States was part of the effort to end slavery in Mexico and all Latin-America and the West Indies.

The struggles of the slaves in Virginia and the slaves of Jamaica, of the slaves of Mississippi and of Haiti, of South Carolina and Cuba—these are all one mighty component of the inspiring human resistance to insult and enslavement. The antislavery men and women in the United States had comrades in the same struggles in Mexico and Brazil, in France and England, in Ireland and Cuba. These revolutionaries knew each other, visited each other and helped each other.

And, of course, the humanistic essence of antislavery and its anti-elitist and basically labor component made all Marxists friends of the struggle to abolish slavery, with the leadership of that undertaking falling upon Marx himself. This brought decisive results during the Civil War with the key role played in the diplomacy of that War by the working classes of Europe.

In this great crusade within the United States there appeared some of the noblest figures not only in the history of our nation but in that of the world. From the best among the Black and white people who preceded us in this country came such colossal figures as the indomitable Harriet Tubman, the clear-visioned Wendell Phillips, the stalwart Sojourner Truth, the brilliant Frederick Douglass, the magnificent John Brown.

Someday a dramatist will appear among us and he or she will be able to do full justice to that moment when the jailed and chained Nat Turner faces the court-appointed questioner who comes seeking an admission from the 30-year old slave-rebel that what he had attempted was foolish and wrong. It was important to the slave-holders that this rebel, whose uprising had rocked their society to its heels, be made to confess failure and fault. This slaveowners' representative came to Nat Turner the day before he was to be hanged. He told Turner that all was lost, that his comrades had been hanged and that he himself would be executed the next day. Tell us, he demanded and implored, that you know that your act was stupid and wrong.

That lackey of the masters reports, himself, what the rebel did and said. He raised himself from his cot, there in the county jail in Virginia back in 1831, stood up, and with one hand shackled to the cement wall he spread his other arm wide and, looking at the inquisitor, said to him: "Was not Christ crucified?"

I believe that in all the record of the history of the United States—with its many moments of high drama, from Bunker Hill to Harper's Ferry, from the Boston Massacre to the Haymarket martyrdom, there is no single moment so filled with drama and

with meaning as that one instant of immortal defiance and challenge.

Such were the struggles of our Abolitionist comrades; such is the heritage of valor and of effectiveness that they have bequeathed to us.

TOWARD COUNTERREVOLUTION: THE SLAVEOWNERS AND SECESSION

One of the main treasures with which to enrich one's knowledge of the crucial Civil War period in United States history has remained unpublished in the archives of the Library of Congress for decades. This is the manuscript diary of Edmund Ruffin (1794-1865) which he began in 1856 and which consumed fourteen books before its author took his own life with the collapse of the Confederacy.

Ruffin made important contributions to agronomy, but his main historical interest—and that which monopolizes his diary— was his ideas concerning slavery, racism and imperialism and his ideological and organizational leadership in the secessionist movement. Ruffin was one of the wealthiest slaveowners in Virginia, had been a member of the State Senate (1823–1826), was president of Virginia's Agricultural Society some thirty years later, was a prolific author of newspaper articles, pamphlets and books, and founded the League of United Southerners, which helped create the actual movement for secession. In recognition of his services to the latter cause, it was Edmund Ruffin who was given the "honor" of actually firing the first shell at Fort Sumter in April 1861.

Except for the biography of Ruffin by Avery O. Craven—first published in 1932 and sympathetic to Ruffin's outlook—no book was devoted to this central figure until forty years had passed, when the project to publish the Ruffin diary saw the appearance of the first of two volumes[1] covering the manuscript entries from their commencement in 1856 until the launching of the armed attack upon the United States in April 1861.

As indicated below, this volume is subtitled "Toward Independence" and in the foreword by Avery Craven one reads that this diary "sheds some light on the psychology of a whole people on their course to revolution." The volume itself, however, substantiates the fact that the secession represented not revolution, but counter-revolution, that it did not reflect the psychology of "a whole people" but the desires of a small oligarchy acting contrary to the desires of the "whole people"—by which, of course, Mr.

Craven means that 65 per cent of the population in the South which was white. In this sense, to refer to the effort spearheaded by Ruffin as one seeking "independence" in any way comparable to efforts for national liberation is misleading; secession was a frantic effort at counter-revolution undertaken by and on behalf of a desperate slave-holding oligarchy faced with internal disintegration and external replacement.

Very little of the external forces—national and international—is in this book; but something of the internal challenge both as this came from the mass of nonslaveholding white people and from the four million Black people in the South is present, and it is this evidence—even in the diary kept by secession's chief propagandist—which gives the present volume its great interest and importance.

Ruffin, it must be remembered, not only was of the class and had the experiences and role summarized earlier; he was himself present at the Southern Commercial Convention in Montgomery, Alabama in 1858; at the execution of John Brown in 1859; at the conventions of the two Democratic Parties, held in Baltimore and in Richmond in 1860; at the secession conventions in South Carolina, Florida and Virginia, 1860–1861; and at the Fort Sumter bombardment in 1861. This, then, is a man of great influence, one who was politically and organizationally at the center of affairs and present at decisive acts of the unfolding of the great drama culminating in the Civil War.

Ruffin was a person whose every interest was to favor secession and whose every motive would be to present the effort to achieve secession as one reflecting a united southern will and "a whole people's" desire. Thus, he insists that those who do not understand "the South" suffer from two "delusions": the notion that "there exists hostility between the nonslaveholders and the slaveholders of the southern states" and that "our slaves" are anything but "loyal" to their owners (entry of March 1, 1860, p. 408). An insistence that both these ideas were "delusions" has been basic to the propaganda of the Bourbons for over a century; it remains dominant to this day in the consciousness of most white people in the United States and constitutes a main part of "history teaching" in this country.

So far are these realities from "delusions" that even this diary of this person, so motivated and so occupied, demonstrates that it was the Ruffins who suffered from delusions—delusions characteristic of exploitative ruling classes who insist that they know "their" people and who in fact know nothing of the masses of people at all. This was true in the past of Ruffins who looked upon Black people as significantly less than people and upon poor white people as rabbles

and ruffians and wretches; it is true in the present of Nixons and their advisors like the Banfields who look upon the so-called common people as "children" or as defective humans who create their own impoverishment and then prefer that condition.

In the 1850s, during the years of this diary, the farms of Ruffin and his sons were devastated five times by fires. He resisted believing that these were the deliberate work of slaves as long as he could; it was only with the fifth conflagration that he was forced to the "dreadful" conclusion that the slaves were in fact responsible (entry of November 13, 1859, p. 355). The reader is not told what this conclusion meant in the lives of the slaves, but he will observe that Ruffin's insistence on the slaves' "loyalty" nevertheless is reiterated by him as late as March 1860.

On another occasion, the train in which Ruffin is riding barely escapes destruction; the rails clearly have been sabotaged and he decides to dismiss it as the work of "some villain" (September 9, 1860, p. 455). As for the fires that frequently devastate the pine trees so vital to the economy of North Carolina, Ruffin affirms that "It is thought that much of this destruction is also committed by the negroes" (April 5, 1857, p. 52), but the reason they do this is because the turpentine work is not of a gang nature and "a negro cannot abide being alone"! This reminds one of the fact that the flight of slaves was seriously ascribed among those slaveowners—and their medical authorities—to a disease peculiar to Black people (and to cats) called "drapetomania" which manifested itself in this otherwise inexplicable impulse among such people (and cats) to flee their environs! As humanity's experience has shown many times—and not least in the present era—"whom the gods would destroy" etc.

As for the class divisions and hostilities among the white population of the South—absolutely basic to its internal politics in the pre-Civil War generation—the entries and the evidences in the Ruffin diary refute his verbalization about northern "delusions" on this point.

Thus, Ruffin records (December 4, 1859, p. 373) a conversation with a Virginia friend who insists that there was widespread popular opposition to secession, especially among the nonslaveholders. The friend is persuaded that among the nonslaveholders, "their jealousy of the richer, as well as self-interest, would cause them to side with the north, and to go for the abolition of slavery."

Ruffin himself records his own feelings (November 11, 1860, p. 482) that "I fear that not one [southern state], unless South Carolina, will be ready to declare for secession as soon as the election of Lincoln is certain." He repeatedly records very considerable Unionist

sentiment late in 1860 and early in 1861 that he himself observes in Virginia, Georgia and Florida (pp. 483, 492, 501, 504, 534–35, 543). In the elections to the emergency convention called in Virginia in February 1861, Ruffin himself observes that "open and avowed immediate secessionists have been successful in but few cases" (p. 544). In similar elections held that same month in Tennessee, Ruffin is forced to confess that there was a majority of 50,000 opposed to secession. And in March 1861, in North Carolina, the result was two to one against secession (pp. 465, 577). As late as April 1861, in his own Virginia, he knows there was a majority opposed to secession and that in the Convention elected to consider the emergency in that State, there were 48 for and 98 against secession as late as April 5, 1861 (pp. 577–78).

Perhaps the decisive admission comes in his entry of April 2, 1861 (p. 576) where Ruffin records a conversation with a former governor of South Carolina, John P. Richardson:

> Heard (confidentially) from ex-Governor Richardson, member of the [South Carolina secessionist] Convention, that it was certain, (as communicated privately by members of each delegation to the General Convention at Montgomery),[2] that it was supposed by the delegates that the majority of the people of every State except S.Ca. *was indisposed to the disruption of the Union—and that if the question of reconstruction of the former union was referred to the popular vote, that there was probability of its being approved.* (Emphasis added.)

It is no wonder, then, that Ruffin, on the same date, tells his diary that it is of greatest importance that the Virginia convention hasten its actions towards secession, so that "a new political machine" would then be "put into full operation"; when that was done, he thought, "the superiority of southern independence and separate nationality [would] be evident to all."

All this should be made explicit. What we have is the assertion by a former South Carolina governor (Mr. Richardson held this position 1840–42) that delegates to the general secessionist convention held in Alabama had told him that *they* knew that secession was *unpopular among the electorate* of their states. This is why in that Alabama convention the idea of submitting the question of secession to a vote—prior to secession itself—was rejected; the members of that convention believed, as they said, that were the question so submitted it would be voted down.

Those delegates, let it be noted, came from the deep South; the feelings on this question in such states as Tennessee, North Carolina and Virginia were stated by Ruffin himself earlier in his diary and

reference has been made to this.

We have, then, leading *advocates* of secession affirming—"confidentially" or in the privacy of diaries—their knowledge that the *Southern electorate*—all white, all male and generally propertied—was in its majority opposed to secession and these affirmations are being made in the very month that Fort Sumter is attacked. So much for the idea that this was a movement for national independence or a movement—as Mr. Craven put it—"of a whole people on their course to revolution."

On the contrary, as the present reviewer wrote some years ago:[3]

> In origin, the Civil War in the United States was an attempted counterrevolution carried out by a desperate slaveholding class. . . . The Confederate assault upon Washington and the secession from the United States was a counterrevolutionary development. It was counterrevolutionary not only in its regressive motivations and its profoundly anti-democratic essence. . . it was counterrevolutionary, too, in that it was done secretly, with malice aforethought, and *against the will of the vast majority of the southern people.*

As one would expect, Ruffin's position on slavery and secession was part of his generally reactionary outlook. This diary throws light upon his rejection of Jeffersonian democracy and especially of the concepts in the Declaration of Independence; his doubts as to the wisdom of the suggested termination of serfdom in Czarist Russia; his contempt for the people of Latin America and his hope that various filibustering assaults upon them might be successful; his support of the aggressions by British imperialism then making history in Asia and Africa.

It shows also the coordinated nature of the secessionist movement, with Ruffin in active organizational work with fellow traitors in Alabama and Mississippi and South Carolina years before the coup actually occurred. Such evidence is not to be dismissed—as the editor of this book does—with the rather flippant remark that it seems to serve those "attracted to the conspiracy theory of secession" (p. *xxxvii*). The evidence proves prior planning and activity on the part of leaders of an oligarchy determined to resist its demise by any means including the employment of force and violence against the Republic.

Successful resistance to the oligarchy's counter-revolution made possible the achievement of the second revolution in our history. Not least in the content of that resistance was the activity of the Black people in the South and the growing disillusionment with and opposition to the Confederacy on the part of most white people in

the South. Both would have been expected by any one who understood the realities of the slavocratic south; it is those realities and their fruition during the Civil War which are still largely omitted or denied in dominant history-writing. The omission and the denial—the perversions of history—have served and now serve as props to the racism that corrodes life in the United States.

With the confederacy's collapse, Edmund Ruffin wrapped his head in the stars and bars and blew out his brains. But he left this diary and it serves as a damning witness of the values, activities and purposes of his class.

NOTES

1. William K. Scarborough, ed., *The Diary of Edmund Ruffin*, Volume I: *Toward Independence, 1856–1861* (Louisiana State University Press: Baton Rouge, 1972).
2. This has reference to the convention held in Montgomery, Alabama, in February 1861, attended by delegates from South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana; it is this convention which formed a provisional Confederate government and drafted its constitution.
3. Herbert Aptheker, *The American Civil War* (International Publishers: New York, 1961), pp. 6, 15. Italics in original.

BLACK-WHITE UNITY: A BASIC THEME AND NEED IN UNITED STATES HISTORY

At the time of the Revolution which gave birth to the United States of America, people of African derivation made up over twenty per cent of the total population; from then to the present Afro-American people have never constituted less than some eleven per cent of the inhabitants of this country. Since the Afro-American people have been overwhelmingly working people—including women and children—the percentage of the total producing population in the United States which has been Black has averaged probably some 25 to 35 per cent. The rate of exploitation of Black people having been greater than that of others, one may understand the consequences of their labor in terms of the production of wealth and the accumulation of capital in the United States.

These constitute basic socio-economic data in the history of the Afro-American people and therefore in the history of the United States. Additionally, Black people made up the overwhelming bulk of the enslaved population in the United States, and the institution of slavery was a basic economic-political-historical reality from about 1700 to the end of the Civil War. Furthermore, in the eleven decades since the end of that war, Black people, as sharecroppers, tenant farmers, peons, and workers—skilled and unskilled, in agriculture, mining, shipping and industry—have been systematically and significantly discriminated against and underpaid, as compared with other workers; this system of super-exploitation and special oppression has spawned and been sustained by racism—a poisonous form of thought and practice which, more than any other single evil in U.S. experience, has divided and therefore weakened democratic and working-class forces.

Those who, in the history of the United States, have fought against tyranny, monarchy, slavery, peonage—let alone those whose development made it possible for them to fight against capitalism—have understood, generally, that such struggles, to be successful, required Black-white unity. The understanding, particularly among white people, has varied greatly in degree and has had different sources. In some cases, the main source seems to have been religious, with influence deriving from the egalitarian teachings present

in all the great religions; in other cases, the main source was secular, drawing on the libertarian thread running through the heart of the Enlightenment and the Age of Reason. Most recently—that is, in the past century and a quarter—a basic source has been Marxism and then Marxism-Leninism, infused as that science is with the liberating essence of the working class and all allies of that fundamental class, especially the nationally and racially oppressed peoples of the earth.

Decisive among white people in terms of the history of the battle for Black-white unity and against racism has been the objective reality that their own well-being, their own advances, their own struggles are not in fact "their own." That is, democratic progress, the advancement of the labor movement, the women's movement, the struggle for education, for health, for housing, for an end to war and preparations for war—for what, in a phrase the immortal Du Bois once called "The Joy of Living"—all of this requires Black-white unity; none of this can be achieved unless racism is fought as an integral part of the battle itself because racism is the main weapon of reaction and the negation of humanism itself.

If a democratic movement, in the United States, does not fight racism, it is not democratic; if a progressive movement in the United States does not fight racism it is not progressive. This is not a matter of sentiment or rhetoric; it is a matter of cold and hard fact and its truth is proven by the history of the United States. Indeed, one might almost say that the demonstration of that truth makes up the history of the United States. Furthermore, we repeat, if a democratic movement does not fight racism, it not only is not democratic but it also will not be and cannot be successful and, of course, it does not deserve success! Fundamental to the very definition of "democracy" is anti-racism.

Three aspects of the history of the United States will be commented upon, briefly, of course, to illustrate the truth of the principles just stated: The Revolution; the Civil War; the labor movement.

The Revolution

Capital comes into the world, as Marx told us, dripping with the blood and sweat of the Africans; observe that the name of the first English slave-trading ship to reach Africa was "Jesus"! All men are created equal, said the revolutionary manifesto drafted by a Virginia slaveowner; and Abigail Adams pointed out that women also existed, and Black people in Massachusetts reminded the legislature of that then-revolutionary state, in January 1777, that: "They cannot but express their astonishment that it has never been considered that every principle from which America has acted in the course of her

unhappy difficulties with Great Britain pleads stronger than a thousand arguments in favor" of those Black people petitioning for an act of emancipation.

To a degree the democratic stimulus of the Revolution—*and the military needs of that Revolution*—did lead to some advances, north of the Mason-Dixon line, in the struggle against chattel slavery; and even south of that line both forces induced the manumission of several thousand Black people and the employment of thousands as soldiers and sailors in the revolutionary forces. This was something, but it was terribly partial, and especially partial in the South where, then, ninety per cent of the Black people toiled.

The failure of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, infected as it was with chattel slavery and racism, to terminate slavery left a cancer in the bowels of the new Republic. Black people at the time warned that if it were not excised it would grow with the growth of the Republic and in time threaten the very life of the country—as, of course, it did within ninety years.

Let it be added that British officers in the field in the South suggested to the War Command in London that if the British troops could raise the standard of an end to slavery this would guarantee an end to the colonial rebellion. This was seriously debated in England but the ruling class there rejected it—though partial and false promises were actually made—and they rejected it because Britain possessed colonies in the West Indies wherein were exploited some 750,000 slaves; because many of the richest slaveowners in Georgia, South Carolina and even Virginia were themselves Tories; and a declaration of freedom would be highly contagious and could not be limited to the slaves of rebels only!

The British rulers, then, faced with growing European opposition, finally admitted defeat in the New World and sued for peace; but the cancer of slavery and racism was not excised and therefore—as Black people had warned—it grew and attacked the vitals of the nation and soon tore the very country apart.

The Civil War

There is no more dramatic and clear illustration of the need for and the reality of Black-white unity in the history of the United States than is afforded by the Civil War. The slaveowners not only dominated the South; they also were the ruling force in national politics from about 1820 to the election of Lincoln. The transformation in the economy of the non-slaveholding portion of the United States was *one* of the basic forces challenging the slaveholders' grip on Washington. The development of industry, of a

a free labor-based agriculture, of a commercial bourgeoisie which increasingly was engaged in business other than that connected with the slave economy, afforded the base for the appearance of an effective new political party—the Republican Party—to challenge the two-party system of slaveocratic domination which had prevailed for over a generation.

The forces behind that transformation wanted and needed tariff policies, money policies, banking policies, and policies for the development of the vast middle section of the nation (especially in terms of transportation and land-use) which were in direct conflict with the traditional policies and programs of the slaveholding class. This made possible increasing influence of and alliance with components of the great and growing Abolitionist movement; it pointed the way toward increasing support of anti-slavery politics by the growing urban working class and by the farmers of the non-slaveholding areas. Simultaneously, opposition to Bourbon domination inside the South among non-slaveholders there and a significant rise in the resistance movements of slaves themselves combined finally to drive the Bourbon oligarchy to the desperate expedient of attempting a counter-revolutionary coup. Thus commenced the Civil War, with the military assault upon the Republic by that desperate slaveholding oligarchy.

To suppress that counter-revolution, only revolutionary conduct would be successful. The Republican party—dominated as it was, even at birth, by the bourgeoisie—was significantly racist and opportunist and moved to the necessary revolutionary policies only with great vacillation and hesitation; but it did move and it did so because if it had not so moved it would not have been able to defeat the Confederacy and establish its own hegemony over the nation. That is, as the Abolitionists kept on insisting—and foremost among them the Black Abolitionists—only a policy of emancipation was capable of saving the Union; at the same time as Frederick Douglass in particular insisted, only a policy of saving the Union would make not only necessary but also realizable the emancipation of the slaves. Here the dialectical unity of the enhancement of democracy, of the salvation of the Republic and the struggle against slavery and racism became crystal-clear.

Hence, there came the enlisting of Black men into the Army and Navy, arming them and using them (finally with equalized pay!) to fight shoulder-to-shoulder with white men against an army of white men fighting for the retention and extension of slavery and the destruction of the United States.

Abroad, Marx, in his leadership role in the First International, threw himself into the effort to enlist the support of the workers in England, France and Germany behind the Lincoln government and the effort to help move that government to the Left; above all, Marx saw the need to develop working-class political and social power in Europe to keep London's Tory government and France of Napoleon the Little (who was seeking the acquisition of Mexico) from fully supporting the Confederacy.

The unity of the Republic and the destruction of slavery made possible the swift development of the productive capacity of the United States and the rapid growth within the United States of the proletariat. Thereafter, the central necessity was the completion of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in the South and the rise of an organized trade union movement and politically conscious working class, allied with the farming masses. The first required the destruction not only of slavery but of the plantation system, and the distribution of the land to those who tilled it; it required also, in the words of Douglass, that the working people, white and Black, have the "ballot-box, the jury-box and the cartridge-box"—that is, the right to vote and be voted for, the cleansing of the judicial system of elitism and racism, and the establishment of a militia and police system that would be fully democratic—i.e., that would not favor the rich and the white.

And the second required, in the never-to-be-forgotten words of Marx himself, an understanding that "while labor in a black skin is branded, labor in a white skin cannot be free." It required, then, the achievement of real proletarian unity which would understand that racism was a poison concocted by the boss and used by the boss to divide and to fatally weaken working people.

But the bourgeoisie, now in full power and thirsting to take over the resources of the South, were not about to permit all this to develop. Hence, that bourgeoisie, in the guise of the Republican party, betrayed its promises as soon as it could, turned the Southern masses over to the tender mercies of the Bourbons and their KKK lackeys, crushed the smaller farmers in the nation and mounted a fierce legal, extra-legal, illegal and sheer-murder assault upon the labor movement. But all such efforts, if successful, are successful only for a limited time; masses remain for they are immortal and their needs remain also and therefore reassert themselves, under new conditions and at new levels, in new periods.

The Labor Movement

An embryonic trade-union and labor movement existed in the nation—even in the slave-South—by the late eighteenth century

and continued to grow with the growth of the working class, so that by the time of the Civil War trade unions were able to play a role of some importance in the winning of the battle against slavery. Thereafter, the creation and growth of a trade union movement depended upon resistance to the boss attack, and a comprehension of the fact that discrimination against workers who were female and against workers who were Black would guarantee that the bosses would win and that the working class in the United States would be weak, unorganized and politically without influence.

The history of the labor movement since the Civil War is a history of fierce and often bloody resistance to a brutal bourgeoisie. It is a history of the struggle to overcome various forms of national prejudices, to understand the absolute necessity of creating real unity among men and women who work and, as a central test and task in the United States, to realize in practice the slogan originated by the Communist Party; "Black and white, unite and fight!"

Where unity was achieved, or to the degree it was achieved by the Knights of Labor, the IWW, the UMW, and above all in the 1930s by the CIO and in the great struggles of the unemployed, then the entire trade-union and labor movements were invigorated, strengthened and relatively successful.

The highest form of such unity in the labor movement, in both theory and practice, has appeared in the Communist movement. Marx, in his writing and struggling, emphasized the need—for example—of unity of Irish and English if both peoples were to achieve real freedom, of the liberation of India if England was to progress, of the liberation of Black people if the white workers were ever to be liberated. And a basic point in Lenin—an essential component of the very meaning of Marxism-Leninism—is the comprehension of the nature of imperialism, of the significance of its main ideological facade, racism, and of the necessity of unity of the struggle against imperialism and against racism with the struggle against capitalism; indeed, Leninism *means* a comprehension of the fact that the struggles for national liberation, for full equality and for socialism are absolutely intertwined and that no one may be successful while another is neglected.

This Black-white unity—the fact that the Communist Party *is* the Party of Black and white unity—has been symbolized also by its leadership throughout its history; from Foster and Ford to Dennis and Davis to Hall and Winston. This has come about naturally, logically, inevitably because of the nature of our country, of its working class and because of the nature of Marxism-Leninism and a Party based upon that science.

Within the history of Black people in the United States, an

awareness of the need for Black-white unity—the *mutual* need—forms a central thread. There have been aberrations on this question in that history, but these have been only aberrations—induced basically by persistent white chauvinism. The fact is that one of the greatest contributions made by Black people to the history of the United States, and particularly to the working class in the United States, has been the leadership offered by Black people on this question of the vital need for Black-white unity.

In the final analysis, however, the responsibility for giving leadership on this question must come from the white working people; they constitute the majority and it is white chauvinism which is the main obstacle to that unity, without which the working class of the United States simply cannot achieve liberation.

On this need for Black-white unity, no one is doing anyone any favors. This is not a question of philanthropy; it is a question of mutual self-interest, of absolute necessity. When that is really understood and acted upon, the speed with which the working class of the United States will march forward and will affirm its political power and will achieve its historical goal of socialism—of human liberation—will astonish the world.

PART II. RACISM AND HISTORIOGRAPHY

RACISM AND HISTORIOGRAPHY

A racist society breeds and needs a racist historiography. Where the racism was blatant and naked and where the relationship of forces was still heavily weighted on the side of the oppressors, the Veil, in the historical profession, seemed all but impenetrable. This was the period when Claude Bowers was *the* authority on Reconstruction and U.B. Phillips was *the* authority on the nature of slavery in the United States.

To persist in such a tactic in the face of what has happened to the world since the Second World War and in the face of the level of the liberation movement of the Afro-American people is not possible. Instead one has today—as part of the effort to retain the substance of racism—an increasing flood of Myrdalian and Freudian literature, as in the works of Arnold Rose, Daniel Moynihan, Harold Cruse, Stanley Elkins, adorned, from time to time, in the rhetoric of a bastardized "Marxism."

Another tactic is the practice of a kind of "separatism" with bookstores being flooded by what is called Black literature, much of it poorly edited and hastily produced— almost improvised—with the obvious intent of making a fast buck. At the same time, what may be called mainstream books—dealing with literature and/or poetry as a whole in the United States, or with the history of the United States, or significant sections thereof, or with important segments of life in the United States, such as higher education, for example—keep appearing, from leading publishers and carrying the names of well-known scholars. But these are as oblivious of the existence of Afro-American people as such books were thirty or forty years ago.

Examples are in order. Professor Frederick J. Hoffman, in his widely used study, *The Twenties; American Writing in the Postwar Decade,* first published by Viking in 1955 and reissued by the Free Press in 1965, notes that those years "were marked by a disrespect for tradition and an eager wish to try out any new suggestions regarding the nature of man—his personal beliefs, convictions, or way to salvation" (p.14). His examination of the works of Faulkner,

Hemingway, Lewis, Waldo Frank, Sherwood Anderson and others, certainly substantiates the thesis.

It would have been significantly bulwarked, however, had Hoffman not confined his idea of American writing to authors whose skins were white. Such provincialism—to use no harsher word—would be a serious weakness in any case, but when discussing the era of the Harlem Renaissance, it becomes positively vitiating. For in creative writing, the twenties saw the appearance of the novels and poetry of Du Bois, Hughes, Rudolf Fisher, Wallace Thurman, Countee Cullen, Claude McKay, James Weldon Johnson, Jessie Fauset, Zora Neale Hurston, Jean Toomer, Eric Waldron, Gwendolyn Bennett and the verse-anthologies edited by William S. Braithwaite. Furthermore, these writers—Black and white—influenced each other and all were influenced by the realities of their environments and that environment was neither all Black nor all white. By ignoring all this, Hoffman is not only obviously falsifying the record of "American" writing; he is, in fact, distorting the work of those white writers whom he does consider.

Professors Richard Hofstadter and Wilson Smith combined their erudition to produce, as editors, a huge two-volume work published by the University of Chicago, in 1961, on *American Higher Education: A Documentary Record.* These volumes ignore the Black component of the "record." In its hundreds of pages, the Afro-American is noted only in a six-page section (pp. 978–84) on "Racial and Religious Barriers" taken from the 1947 *Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education*, and not in terms of what he says or does or thinks or wants, but only in terms of what the Commission says he faces. Hofstadter and Smith have produced, therefore, a truncated and distorted—and racist—history.

In 1969, Holt, Rinehart and Winston produced a two-volume work of some 900 oversized pages, entitled *The History of the United States: Source Readings* (from 1600 to the present), edited by Neil Harris of Harvard, David Rothman of Columbia and Stephan Thernstrom of Brandeis. Oscar Handlin of Harvard, in his preface, assures the reader that the two volumes "bring to life the people and events of the past" and that they "illuminate the development of the Americans through their whole history." But in the first volume, which goes through 1876, by Black people one finds only eight pages from the (by now fairly well-known) "Confessions" of Nat Turner; nothing else. This might be compared with—for instance—in the same volume nine pages from Webster's efforts to reform spelling in 1789 and eight pages on Dix's work for the

mentally ill in Pennsylvania in 1845. Again, in Volume Two, going through the year 1968, one finds a total of nine pages from Black people, and six of these come from Booker T. Washington, while Du Bois is "represented" by a three-page snippet from a 1903 work. More space is given to Josiah Strong's opinion of "the (White) Church's Role" written in 1893 than to that given to Washington and Du Bois put together! Surely this is tokenism with a vengeance and not a successful effort, despite Professor Handlin, to "illuminate the development of the Americans."

Doubleday issued, late in 1969 and early in 1970, as Anchor Books, two volumes in the "Documents in American Civilization Séries." The Series as a whole has as general editors, Hennig Cohen and John William Ward; the particular volumes are *The Strenuous Decade: A Social and Intellectual Record of the Nineteen-Thirties,* edited by Daniel Aaron, Director of American Studies at Smith, and Robert Bendiner, a member of the editorial Board of the *New York Times;* and *The 1940's: Profile of a Nation In Crisis,* edited by Chester Eisinger, Chairman of the Committee on American Studies at Purdue.

The volume of over 400 pages devoted to the "social and intellectual record of the 1930's" contains four pages from a Black author, and those come from Richard Wright describing Joe Louis' victory over Max Baer in 1935! A few pages are devoted to Father Divine, but these are from white authors and one poem is devoted to Scottsboro—and it is from a white person! And that is the record of the thirties!

The volume of over 500 pages devoted to the 1940's and subtitled "a nation in crisis" is absolutely devoid of any reference to or any word from the twenty million Black people then living in the United States, whose condition and position and demands constituted, then as they do today a basic component in that nation's crisis.

The doctrine of "separate but equal" is as phoney in publishing as it has been in law and in reality. Fundamental to the history of the United States is the struggle of the masses of its population—of every color and every ethnic and national origin—against repression, oppression and exploitation. Central to this record of struggle has been that waged by the Afro-American people; in so struggling they have forged for themselves an inspiring history and they have simultaneously affected in a decisive way every aspect of the history of the United States as a whole. No aspect of that history—whether of labor or farmer, or student or intellectual, of the women's movement, of the peace movement, whether diplomatic history or legal history or economic or political or social or

ideological, whether of church or press, of cooperatives or science, whether looked at in some detail or examined in totality—everything, absolutely everything that has ever appeared or ever occurred in the United States or America must be understood in terms of the relationship thereto of the Black people in the United States. To the degree that that relationship is minimized—not to speak of being ignored—to that degree the historiography is false and is racist.

Nothing less than this must be the demand of historians and the goal of their work as we move into the final decades of the twentieth century—a generation that will, I think, mark the "final conflict" with the monster known as racism—made in the U.S.A.

AMERICAN HISTORY: ILLUSION AND REALITY

In the academic establishment of the United States, the most distinguished historian is Henry Steele Commager. Mr. Commager began his teaching career back in 1926 at New York University, where he remained a decade. Thereafter for twenty years he was a professor at Columbia University; since the end of World War II, he has held chairs at Cambridge, Oxford and Uppsala Universities and now is Simpson Lecturer at Amherst College. In 1972, Mr. Commager was awarded the Gold Medal for History of the American Academy of Arts and Letters.

With Samuel Eliot Morison, Commager is the author of the single most widely used text in U.S. history—*The Growth of the American Republic*—and his massive collection—*Documents of American History*—has been a basic source book for two generations of Americans.

Mr. Commager also impresses all who have met him—including the present writer—with his cordiality and courtesy; of much greater moment, Commager was one of the terribly few eminent figures in American letters who stood firm against McCarthyism in the worst period. His pen produced some of the very rare essays that major commercial outlets would publish in that era which tried to remind the nation of the values of the Bill of Rights.

It is necessary to state, however, that Commager's eminence and the wide adaptation of his books result not from his admirable qualities and the felicity of his prose but rather from the respectability of his viewpoint. Mr. Commager is a celebrant of the "success" of the United States and is the more persuasive in this role, since he evidently ardently believes in the myth himself.

Commager's book, *The Empire of Reason: How Europe Imagined and America Realized the Enlightenment,* published in 1977, is an elaboration of that myth. As its subtitle indicates and as its preface affirms, "the thesis of this book" is that "the Old World imagined, invented, and formulated the Enlightenment, the New World—certainly the Anglo-American part of it—realized it and fulfilled it." Commager summarizes the essence of the Enlightenment well, I think: "That men were not the sport of Nature or the victims of

society, but that they might understand the one and order the other"(p. 71).

Let us quote, somewhat fully, Commager's elaboration of his thesis, the more so as we feel it is quite wrong-headed:

> It is not perhaps surprising that we should be skeptical of a society that preached liberty and practiced slavery, but it is surprising that we should be equally skeptical of a society that achieved a larger degree of political and social democracy, constitutional order, effective limits on the pretensions of government, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, civil liberties, popular education, and material well-being than any other on the globe (p. xiii).

This is wrong-headed because it misses the point. It is not a question of being "skeptical" of a society which preaches liberty and practices slavery and "equally skeptical" of a society that does some other things and does them well. One is not skeptical; one is condemnatory. And it is wrong to bifurcate this society so that on the one hand—alas—it was marked by slavery and on the other hand—hooray—it was splendid. Commager does this throughout his book; he will hail conditions in the United States and then, usually parenthetically, notice the existence of slavery as the "exception." But slavery in the United States was not an "exception"; it was a fundamental aspect of the social, economic, political and psychological life and history of the early pre-Civil War United States with which Commager's book deals.

Commager's book—like his *Documents* and his *Growth of the Republic*—ignores Black people, but any history of the United States which does this suffers from a fatal defect from the viewpoint of history writing. It is only in his section of Notes (on p.294) that Commager gives the population data for the United States in 1760 and 1780 and 1790 and these show, of course, that the Black people constituted about 21 per cent of the tabulated population, so that while in 1760 there were some one and a half million white people here, the number of Black people was well over 300,000, and in 1780 of some 3.3 million people who were counted, almost 600,000 were Black and in the 1790 census, of less than 4 millions altogether, about 760,000 were Black people.

In addition, these population data ignore altogether the original inhabitants of the United States and to this day so elementary a question as their numbers is a matter of keen debate among historians. But in this period the so-called Indian peoples surely numbered about 500,000 within the limits of European conquest and

probably as many as one million. But except insofar as their presence impinged upon the European, these hundreds of thousands are ignored in Commager's text, and their *active* role in history is missing. This is again a fatal defect in writing "American" history, but when writing of that history in the eighteenth century such an omission is simply vitiating.

Further, in Commager's " Empire" there were no social classes—not only no slaves in any active and effective sense. That is, among the European-derived peoples, Commager presents a picture of this empire where "all the citizens belonged, in effect to the same class" (p. 127). While in Europe, he writes, the law "was an arm of the ruling classes" in America "law could be independent [of what?] and even radical" because in the United States one had "a ruling class that embraced most of the population" (p. 177). No wonder ingenuity, wisdom, sagacity, virtue are just a few of the descriptions Commager marshals (as on p. 176) to describe the directors of this empire. But John Adams, who knew the "rich, the well-born and the able" when he lauded them, and Thomas Jefferson, who advertised for his slaves when they fled from him, and Alexander Hamilton, who believed the people to be beasts, and John Jay, who affirmed that those who owned the country should [not only would, but *should*—H.A.] govern it, would not only have been astonished but would also have been appalled that any one could believe that they would be presidents and supreme court judges and cabinet members of a state whose ruling class "embraced most of the population"!

The fact is that of the population of the United States in the period described by Commager, half who were women were outside the ken of politics, that one-fifth of the population who were slaves were outside the ken of politics, that another one-fifth of the population who were Indians were outside politics and that another fifth of the male population who were indentured servants were outside politics and that another fifth of the male population who were impoverished also were outside politics.

While, in the body of his text, Commager writes (p. 195) that in the United States in the period he is describing, "involved in their governmental enterprises [were] almost the whole of the white adult population" here he has simply "forgotten" the women and also has forgotten his own footnote (p. 184) showing that even in Massachusetts of the white men *entitled to vote* only about 25 per cent "bothered to do so" and that in Maine, as another example, the figure "was not more than one in twenty."

And again in a footnote—in his footnotes and reference section in

the back of the book some of the realities of this period are buried—the reader is told that "the great majority of those entitled to vote did not do so" (p. 301n.). But why they did not vote is not discussed. There were many reasons, but probably the main one was the fact that there were fairly steep property qualifications for holding office[1] so that even if one could vote, since candidates for office were restricted by law to significant property owners (as well as believers in certain religious tenets, in many cases), why bother to vote? Clearly even those who legally could vote, under such circumstances, logically would conclude—and most of them did so conclude, apparently—that taking the time to vote would be ludicrous or meaningless.

Again, in his notes (p. 278), Commager remarks that some "champions of America were given to exaggeration" by denying the existence of poverty in the United States, which in the text Commager himself has done, in effect. Commager then refers to the essay on poverty in Philadelphia in this period by Gerald Nash (published in the *William and Mary Quarterly*, January 1976). But Nash is only one of several younger historians who have brought some reality to the investigation of social conditions in the eighteenth century in the United States. In addition to Nash there is the work of Allan Kulikoff, Lee Soltow, James A. Henretta, Raymond A. Mohl, Jackson Turner Main and, in particular, Edward Pessen—none of whom is so much as mentioned by Commager—all of which has shown the United States to have been a sharply class-divided society (among its white population) with a high degree of poverty, a very considerable concentration of wealth in a relatively small percentage of the population and with a notable persistence of such wealth concentrated in the hands of substantially similar families.[2]

The above is not written in any mood of debunking or muckraking. It is not written with any intention of denying the significance and the progressive character of the American Revolution and the *relatively* positive character of the new Republic given its era and place. But that Republic must be examined realistically and critically and dialectically; without such a Marxian analysis the truth about the United States at any particular period in history cannot be determined. Furthermore, without such analysis the source for the kind of development that the United States has had—from inspirer of anticolonial and bourgeois-democratic revolutions in the world to bastion of what is left of the colonial system and main supporter of reactionary regimes from Pinochet's Chile to Voerster's South Africa—cannot be comprehended. From its beginnings, the

bourgeois-democratic nature of the Republic was scarred by slavery, male supremacy, racism, expansionism and genocidal tendencies and practices. The struggle against these atrocious features has been a never-absent and magnificent feature of the history of the United States and constitutes that element in its heritage which all defenders of the best in our past cherish and strive to bring into the fruition of the twentieth century—into that fruition known as socialism.

NOTES

1. For example, a governor of Massachusetts had to own a freehold worth at least one thousand pounds and the governor of South Carolina had to own one worth at least ten thousand pounds.
2. For details see this writer's *Early Years of the Republic: 1783–1793* (International Publishers: New York, 1976), esp. chapter 11.

HEAVENLY DAYS IN DIXIE: OR, THE TIME OF THEIR LIVES [I.]

The above suggested title is much more accurate than the one chosen by Messrs. Fogel and Engerman for the book which is the current "sensation" in the publishing market.[1] Their volume is the most ardent defense of slavery in the United States since George Fitzhugh's *Sociology for the South* was published in 1854; it also is the sharpest attack upon the Abolitionist movement since the mob made up—as the contemporary press stated—of "gentlemen of property and standing" tried to lynch William Lloyd Garrison in Boston in 1835.

After Shockley in "genetics" and Jensen in "education" and Banfield in "sociology" and Styron with his "confessions"—and after Nixon with his "busing" and other code words for blatant racism—nothing is more logical than the appearance of a book that Jefferson Davis could properly claim as his ideological offspring. Naturally, such a book is promptly and glowingly reviewed by the *Wall Street Journal*, and by the daily and *Sunday New York Times*. The passionate dedication to the cause of the liberation of Black people on the part of those distinguished periodicals is of course well known.

Professor C. Vann Woodward of Yale, who had earlier announced that Styron's travesty on Nat Turner was illuminating and successful, was somewhat more noncommital about the Fogel-Engerman concoction; still his review of several pages made up the main feature in a recent issue of the very influential *New York Review of Books*. Meanwhile, the authors have hit the lecture trail, spiced with nationally televised interviews, etc. As they say in the trade, Little-Brown has itself a hot product!

Thoroughly to rebut this work would require a volume twice its size; within the necessary limits of a review essay—even where space allotment is quite generous—examination will be made only of certain central features, assumptions, practices and conclusions. Certain generalizations will first be offered.

The failures of the book are reflected in the following main points:

The authors set up straw men and present caricatures of past

literature in the field; from these misrepresentations come their "sensational" findings.

The basic reliance of the book is upon the United States Census schedules and reports during (and immediately after) slavery. These schedules and reports during that period in particular were grossly and notoriously deficient and inaccurate in general; they were, also, especially faulty as concerns Afro-American people (both slave and free) because of the racism that characterized the Census work and because of the profound political implications of questions concerning the slaves and the free Black population. There is a considerable literature on all of this; no doubt at all exists about the truth of what has been stated. But there is no hint in the Fogel-Engerman work of these realities concerning the fundamental source they used for their findings. This alone makes the work utterly meretricious.

The book completely misrepresents the realities of the slave system as concerns especially sexual enslavement, cruelty, the slaveowners' machinery of control, their intense fear of the slaves, the reality of the slaves' resistance.

The main conclusion of the book—that the Black people experienced relatively splendid conditions, certainly from a physical point of view, during slavery and that they tended to identify themselves with the interests of the masters and to make therefore splendidly productive, proficient and contented enforced laborers—is the main conclusion of the proslavery propaganda of people like Thomas R. Dew and Edmund Ruffin and of later adherents of the moonlight and magnolia school from Thomas Dixon to Ulrich Bonnell Phillips. Dew, Ruffin, Dixon and Phillips were wrong; Fogel and Engerman are also wrong.

The depiction of the Abolitionist movement is what one would expect from the above view of slavery: that movement was ill-informed and fanatical, however noble its motivations may or may not have been. It is a movement that is portrayed as completely made up of white people—mostly rich white people—and all from the North; and a movement suffering from significant racism which also very much limited their ability to comprehend how hard-working and skilled and productive the slaves really were. Everything in this depiction is wrong; the movement was a Black-white one; it was a Northern-Southern one; it was—even for the white members—infinitely advanced over the rest of the nation in terms of its opposition to racism and, contrary to the flat assertion of Fogel-Engerman, one of its main and explicit commitments was towards the elimination of racism and discrimination, as well as of slavery itself. Further, the class composition of the Abolitionist

movement was overwhelmingly workers, artisans, mechanics, and poorer farmers; this was true of the white components of the movement, let alone those who were Black. This does not mean that there were not some in the white movement who were well-to-do, as Gerrit Smith among the white and James Forten among the Black participants, but the vast majority of the leaders and the rank and filers in the movement were as devoid of any significant property ownership as were William Lloyd Garrison and Frederick Douglass.

The analysis rejects what it sees as the dual nature of the approach hitherto taken to the experience of slavery—the enslaved as "inferior" by nature (biology) or made in fact inferior by conditions (environmental); that is, that the enslaved *were* "Sambo" in fact and by nature or became "Sambo" because of the oppression which created a broken and sick people. The authors feel that their book "rescues" the Afro-American people from both stereotypes, for it denies that the enslavement was oppressive! Indeed, this is the point of the book's title, *Time on the Cross*—the 350 years of slavery *and* of misrepresentation of that institution, with the latter "torment"—the misrepresentation—more important than the former in the eyes of the authors!

The conventional alternatives—Phillipsian or Myrdalian—offered by the authors do not exhaust those available. There is a third and it is the one that pervades the writings of the leading Black scholars, from Benjamin Brawley to John Hope Franklin, from Carter G. Woodson to W. E. B. Du Bois, as well as certain white scholars—some of whom were or are Marxists—including Frederic Bancroft, Harvey Wish, Bella Gross, Elizabeth Lawson, James S. Allen, Kenneth W. Porter and the present writer. This insists upon the realities of slavery in the United States—that "most shameless" system of exploitation, as Marx correctly called it—and the realities of the activity and resistance of the Black people who endured it.

The fire did not consume the victims; it tempered them. With oppression there is victimization, but if one believes that nothing but a victim is produced, he does not understand the dialectics of oppression. Further, oppression debases the oppressor, not the oppressed. The latter resist in ten thousand ways and forge their own culture, psyche and spirit while doing so—their own morality, religion, music, folklore, literature and heroes. If one wishes to understand slavery and the people it molded one must *listen* to their songs; one must *study* Gabriel, Vesey, Turner, Douglass, Sojourner Truth and Harriet Tubman; one must labor for *comprehension* of the "many thousand gone" and the millions always "coming back."

To understand slavery in the United States and the people created by it—if one is in a hurry and can study one book, and most people in the United States seem to be in a hurry, even if they spend thousands of hours with computers—one must read and ponder and absorb for example, David Walker's *Appeal to the Colored Citizens of the World* (1829). This is not mentioned by Fogel-Engerman (and just how one would put *that* book into numbers, I cannot imagine) among the nearly four hundred titles listed in volume two of their work, but it is infinitely more revealing of what slavery was than the *Wall Street Journal's* newly recommended text.

Other methodological and analytical failures vitiate this work—truncated quotations, serious omissions, misreading of cited sources, contemptuous dismissal of significant works—such as Bancroft's *Slave-Trading in the Old South*—in a manner that is as arrogant as it is fallacious.

The "sensational" quality of this book is supposed to be its rebuttal of what the authors call (p. 10), "the traditional characterization of the slave economy." This characterization, they write, consists of ten features; the fact is that several are dead horses flayed at great length by the authors and the remainder are presented in aborted or caricatured forms.

Rare, indeed, for example, is the serious student of slavery in the United States who believes it was "irrationally kept in existence by plantation owners who failed to perceive or were indifferent to their best economic interests." With rare exceptions, scholars (and everyone else) have understood that slavery is instituted in order to make money from the slaves' labor and that a system of slavery is maintained, basically, because in the opinion of the slaveowners it pays. How well it paid in different periods, etc., are no doubt legitimate—though hardly urgent—areas of inquiry for students, but that the system of slavery would exist in the United States for over two hundred years because of pride or because the owners were stuck with it or because they conceived of it as "a way of life" or because they had a patriarchal interest in "their" slaves, or out of stubbornness because others attacked it, etc., are propositions that could be taken seriously only in a country which takes Shockley seriously.

Another of the "traditional" concepts which we are told awaited the Fogel-Engerman team of "real scientists" to demolish was the belief that the system of slavery was "economically moribund on the eve of the Civil War." This is sheer nonsense and was an idea that had some currency among a small group of historians (mostly

of anti-Abolitionist persuasion) some forty years ago; but anyone who could read knew that the production of cotton and tobacco doubled between 1850 and 1860 and this is hardly the way a "moribund" economy would behave!

Much is made of the Fogel-Engerman "discovery" that slaves were not "lazy!" Of course, "lazy" is a ruling-class concept and only those who do all the work can be "lazy"—the rich are idle! To think of slaves as "lazy" when it was they who basically produced the lumber and coal and hemp, rice, sugar, indigo, cotton, tobacco and resin in the South was something taken seriously only by Bourbons. Of course they were not "lazy" but they did frequently seek to produce as little as possible and there did exist a special group of what were called "slave-breakers" and while these are described at length in a book such as Frederick Douglass's autobiography, they find no place in this sensation-making work by Professors Fogel and Engerman!

Of course, the idea of the "laziness" of the Afro-American was part of the racist stereotypes concocted by the slaveowners and of their disgusting efforts at rationalizing the force and brutality that characterized their system; but that any serious students of the slave system, within the past thirty years, would place any credence in such garbage passes belief.

The context of this myth and its rationalization and the realities of the system producing both may be found in part of one paragraph in the editor's introduction to *The Diary of Colonel Landon Carter of Sabine Hall, 1752–1778:*

> Keeping Negroes busy was especially important, not only because they might meditate their freedom or their "master's destruction" if they had too much idle time, but also because they were less honest and more imperfect than white men. Unlike other men who were "spurred on to diligence by rewards," "kindness to a Negro" seemed to be "the surest way to spoil him," and only by maintaining strict discipline could the master fulfill his responsibility to the slaves to keep them from lapsing into a life of dishonesty and vice. "Indeed Negroes are devils," Carter declared in disgust in August, 1778, "and to make them otherwise than slaves will be to set devils free."

There is more revelation in those one hundred words so far as slaveowners in the United States were concerned than in the several hundred pages of the *Wall Street Journal's* favorite description of that "peculiar institution."

Another of the allegedly "traditional" concepts bravely demolished by this work is the idea that the work of the slaves was entirely unskilled. Once again I am hard put to know who are the scholars holding this "traditional" view. Certainly anyone who spent a week going through contemporary sources of any kind knows that slaves—and free Black people—were carpenters, masons, coopers, mechanics, artisans, barbers, pilots; that they worked in factories and mines as well as plantations; and that, for example, the intricate grill work on Jefferson's plantation was made by his slaves. The literature on all aspects of this feature of Black history is voluminous; it appears in the very early work of Du Bois, as his *The Philadelphia Negro* (1899), for example, in the first writings of Carter G. Woodson, in the first volume of his *Journal of Negro History,* in the work on free Black people by John Hope Franklin, Lorenzo J. Greene, Luther P. Jackson and literally dozens more.

Much is made of the fact that slaves functioned in an urban environment as well as rural (too much, actually, though the authors sometimes contradict themselves on this point, as on other points); that the renting out of slaves was common especially in the cities; that some accumulated money and some purchased their freedom; and that beginnings of class differentiation among Black people existed during slavery. Once again, no serious student of slavery would find any of this new—let alone demolishing "conventional" views.[2]

Some of these findings may have seemed startling to Fogel and Engerman; if so, this reflects on their earlier education and not on the state of Afro-American historiography among those who had spent any time at all in that discipline.

In certain other areas—as in the reality of cruelty, the living conditions of the slaves, the particular position of women among the slaves—Fogel-Engerman do not demolish "conventional" views among contemporary serious scholars in the area of Black history; what they do is swallow hook, line, and sinker the propaganda of the slaveowners as ladled out by their chief purveyor among twentieth century historians—Ulrich Bonnell Phillips.

The presentation of the system of slavery in terms of what it meant for the slaves is fully in accord with the presentation of the late U. B. Phillips: contented, nonresistant, highly cooperative slaves. Or, to quote Fogel-Engerman (p. 147): "What planters wanted was not sullen and discontented slaves who did just enough to keep from getting whipped. They wanted devoted, hard-working, responsible slaves who identified their fortunes with the fortunes of their masters"—and the point of all the pages before and after that quotation is that that is exactly what they succeeded in getting!

The central features of the racist mythology of the slaveowners in the United States were not characterizations of laziness or stupidity or docility, or thievishness or savagery or imitativeness or lasciviousness—or other racist terms and epithets which do appear in Phillips' work, since he published back in 1918 and since with his upper-class Georgia background and allegiance such terms were second-nature. These terms do not appear in the Fogel-Engerman work—and one must hope and believe are not in their minds. But the terms and the descriptions themselves were *not* basic to the mythology of the slaveowners. The central feature of that mythology was that their slave system was splendid and efficient and placid and well ordered (unless "outside agitators" appeared) exactly because the slaves they held—Afro-American people—were natural slaves and were in this sense unique among the peoples of the world. *They* loved their chains and hugged them and hardly knew they wore them—which was why slaveowners did not "really" need chains! It is true that simultaneously a contradictory image appeared—as reflected in the quotation from Colonel Carter—to the effect that Black people were really "devils" or possessed of especially fierce and savage natures. But then, madness is filled with contradiction and both ideas were widely expressed (sometimes by the same person) in slaveowners' propaganda; both "justified" enslavement, for in the one case it was a natural condition of born slaves and in the other slavery was required, as Colonel Carter said, if the "devils" were to be productive at all!

But the point was that with "our" slaves, with the Afro-Americans, one could get and did get "devoted, hard-working, responsible slaves who identified their fortunes with the fortunes of their masters." That is the heart of the moonlight-magnolia-mint-julep mythology; that is the heart of Fitzhugh's propaganda, of Phillips' apologetics, of Margaret Mitchell's *Gone with the Wind* and of the latest sensation for Madison Avenue—the Fogel-Engerman opus.

Even from the viewpoint of the ostensible purpose of the Fogel-Engerman book—i.e., to treat only the "economics" of slavery (of course their book does much more)—the omission of any consideration of the machinery of control is a significant failing. This is because the cost of that machinery—of paying for executed and banished slaves, the costs of militia and patrol, of police and city guards, of hunting runaways, of paying for the expense of forays against maroons, for suppressing insurrection and conspiracy, paying informers and spies, the cost of the weaponry—does make up a significant component of the economics of slavery. Thus, in the

1850's a good slave-hunting dog would bring as much as $300; from 1801–1806, Virginia sentenced to banishment 57 slaves for conspiratorial involvement and from 1792 to 1833 Virginia executed 130 slaves for killing or trying to kill masters, mistresses and overseers. Each one of those slaves cost the state hundreds of dollars and that is only the cost for one state for one generation or part of one generation, for only one aspect, really, of the machinery of control. All of the above does not touch at all, for example, such costs to slaveowners as slaves done to death by individuals nor the scores of slaves massacred in Virginia during the panic of 1831–1832 after the Turner uprising.

Not only is the omission of all such costs—and dozens of related items—a serious oversight for scholars seeking to estimate the costs of slaveholding; it is also true that the data for most such expenses would be readily available in archives and official reports, *would go back to the beginnings of slavery and would be relatively complete and fairly accurate.* They would be ideal material for cliometricians and econometricians, such as Fogel and Engerman, and would be splendid numbers to put into computers.

But the source used by Fogel and Engerman in greatest part—that is the U.S. Census reports and schedules—did not even pretend to compile serious data on the slave population until 1830 so that it is only the final generation of the system that one can even hope to examine with such figures. But not only are the data, on their face, exceedingly limited and impossible to compare in terms of time-span; in addition and of fundamental importance in estimating the Fogel-Engerman book—*in terms of its own pretensions*—is the fact the *utter unreliability of the U.S. Census, especially throughout the nineteenth century and most particularly in terms of the Black people, is quite notorious* and is something that was admitted repeatedly even by those in charge of the Census! There is no hint of this in the Fogel-Engerman book.[3]

Having in mind the question of slavery and its realities, then, it is necessary to go into something of the history of the United States Census so far as Afro-American people are concerned.

In the censuses of 1790, 1800 and 1810 the *only* material on slaves was their number—exactly as cattle—and this number was obtained from information given by their owners or their agents. In 1820, for the first time, the census takers were directed to obtain an age and sex classification for the slave (and free Black) population; again so far as the slaves were concerned, the people questioned were not the slaves but their owners (or agents) and this remained true throughout the history of slavery. Hence, all data in the census

relative to slaves *were obtained by white census takers who interviewed white people.*

It is only with the censuses of 1850 and 1860 that a separate schedule for the enumeration of slaves was begun; in this case there appeared the name and location of the slaveholder and a list of his slaves with age, sex, color (i.e. black or "mulatto"), number of slaves manumitted, number of fugitives, and indication of those held to be idiotic, insane, mute and blind. The 1860 Census, for the first time, included a count of slave houses—again, of course, as stated by the slaveowners.

In the 1850 census there was begun—for white people and free Black people—an attempt at getting data on what was called "domestic condition" with males separated from females, with ages indicated and with numbers unmarried, married and widowed. During slavery what the census called "conjugal condition" was not asked of the owners concerning their slaves; for them only sex and age differentiation appeared for basic population data. This followed the fact that no marriage between slaves was legally recognized since this required a contract; hence the data concerning "family" and married and unmarried slaves which appear and reappear on dozens of pages in the Fogel-Engerman book derive not from census records at all but from plantation journals, sales and trading records, etc., which are very incomplete and which have natural biases in terms of sales of the "goods" and which, in any case, always come from records kept by slaveowners. Those records themselves are never truly concerned with actual parentage but only with physical proximity, etc.

To all this may be added the fact that original census schedules for whole states and for several census years are utterly missing, having been lost or destroyed. This is true, for example, for the year 1820 of the states of Missouri, Alabama and Arkansas; for the year 1810 for Missouri, Mississippi, and Georgia, etc. Within individual states, also, schedules for particular counties, where these do exist, are sometimes illegible; this is true, for instance, in the case of several counties in Alabama in 1860.[4]

To the reality of highly incomplete records, and that census takers were white and questioned only white people—so far as data on slaves were concerned—is to be added the fact that the Census itself was utterly unprofessional until the twentieth century so that complaints about its data recur time after time apart from racism. Dr. Carroll Wright, as late as 1900, in the source cited earlier, stated that the Bureau was unable to function properly because of "the entirely temporary character of the census organization." He

remarked that until 1830 "all sorts of sizes and shapes of books and sheets were used" by the census takers; that an early effort to obtain data on manufacturing and agriculture contained *"numerous and very considerable imperfections"* (italics in original), that the printed reports for 1830 were based upon work "so hastily and heedlessly done that it must be regarded as absolutely worthless"; that the 1840 census contained "most glaring and remarkable errors" which resulted in "most extraordinary discrepancies." The Superintendent of the Census for 1850, in introducing the published results, made a strong plea for the establishment of some kind of regular statistical office and the hiring of a professional staff. He added: "Unless there is machinery in advance at the seat of Government no census can ever be properly taken and published." He said also: "In 1840 returns were given out by the job to whoever would take them" and that "in 1850 such was the pressure of work that almost anyone [who was white!—H.A.] could at times have had a desk" to participate in the "scientific" work.

It was only in 1891 that any serious effort was made for the establishment of a permanent census office—and it did not succeed then. As late as 1896, the American Economic Association and the American Statistics Association appealed to the government for some kind of permanent and professional staff to operate the Census and added, "in many respects the Census reports are unsatisfactory to us as students of statistics and to the people of the United States." An actual Census Bureau was only established by legislation enacted in 1899. The quite unsatisfactory state of the Census data was affirmed then, by professional associations, as late as 1896—and the affirmation was quite independent of the racism that characterized the Census effort (of which more later).

Moreover, studies published in professional journals—such as that by Dr. Hazel, cited earlier—have shown that the method of sheer *counting* of slaves was significantly faulty, tending first of all to the exaggeration of the numbers of urban slaves (largely because the location of slaves was given as that of the master's address and owners of slaves often lived in cities and towns while many of their slaves were employed on plantations) and secondly tending to undercount slaves in general. Thus, Dr. Hazel, making a detailed study of all available population data for one of the counties of Alabama in 1860, showed that the census "lost" at least 183 slaves in that one county.[5] One might point out that both of these errors would reduce the numbers of slaves on plantations; since the data in the Fogel-Engerman book are not only based largely on the census figures for slaves themselves but also reach conclusions as to conditions

faced by slaves—for example, their diets—on the basis of mathematical computation relating slave numbers to data on production of foods, if the slave numbers are faulty then obviously all calculations based upon them are faulty. This is pointed to as a purely technical deficiency; it does not touch the main deficiency—i.e., the racism permeating the method of acquiring, reporting and publishing the census data.

Now, as to that racism and the census figures—used as a kind of biblical source by Fogel-Engerman.

First, we repeat, all employees of the census effort throughout the era of slavery were white; these employees asked no questions at any time of the slaves themselves. All data reported as to slaves were collected by these white men talking only to other white men—and doing this in the slave South.

Second, those in charge of the census work were Southern; they were the appointees of Administrations notoriously proslavery. This was strikingly true, for example, of the Superintendent of the Census for the 1850 census—crucial to the Fogel-Engerman book. He was appointed by President Pierce and his name was J. D. B. De Bow. De Bow (1820–1867), born in Charleston, was the editor (1844) of the *Southern Quarterly Review*, and in 1846 became the publisher, in New Orleans, of the single most influential magazine of the slaveholding class—*De Bow's Review*. He also served the University of Louisiana as a professor of political economy. During the Civil War he was chief cotton purchasing agent of the Confederacy.

It was De Bow who said: "The negro was created essentially to be a slave, and finds his highest development and destiny in that condition." Professor Broadus Mitchell wrote the truth when he commented of De Bow that he was "an outspoken and violent partisan" of the slave South.[6]

Indisputable evidence has been presented above of the utter unreliability of the pre–Civil War censuses in general. The racist auspices and mechanics of these censuses also cannot be controverted. Such considerations alone would surely militate against basing one's description and estimate of the slave institution largely upon the data from that source; surely one who nevertheless undertook this would, under ordinary requirements of scholarship, warn readers of these basic deficiencies and then try to indicate how, despite them, reality has been achieved. In the Fogel-Engerman work, however, there is no indication to the reader that the figures used from various censuses (and other sources) are other than holy writ and data are offered and tables drawn not in terms of round numbers—

which would be bad enough!—but in terms of precise figures and percentages to minute totals—for all the world like a Joe McCarthy announcing that he has in his hand a list of 652 of this and 318 of that and 423 of the other!

With just the considerations raised it is almost incredible that this effort is offered as—at least—a scientific piece of work in the area of history. But, in addition, that *the census statistics were deliberately misused as political and diplomatic weapons by the slaveholding class and by the United States government is a fully documented fact in the historical literature.* Again, however, not a whisper of this reaches a reader of this book. It should be added that the censuses of the post–Civil War period, especially that of 1870, were particularly distorted and racist and again deliberately used to attack the Reconstruction effort; data from this census also appear in the Fogel-Engerman volume and again with no indication of its viciousness and worthlessness.

Here are some specifics.

In the period prior to the Civil War, the census work was attached to the office of the Secretary of State. Under President John Tyler, the Secretary of State was John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina—the personification of the political and ideological defense of slavery in the United States. Calhoun—and other significant officeholders of this era, such as Robert J. Walker of Mississippi and Abel P. Upshur of Virginia—deliberately used census figures concerning Black people—slave and free—which they knew were false and used them in diplomatic efforts to justify the expansion of slavery.

The Abolitionist movement developed a literature exposing the errors and lies of the censuses in relationship to slavery and Black people; and in particular, Black people themselves in convention assembled devoted careful consideration to these falsehoods, appointed commissions to investigate them and published detailed refutations of the colossal distortions which carried the imprimatur of the United States Census. Indeed, the struggle over the lies of the pre–Civil War censuses provides background for one of the most heated passages in the well-known diary of the redoubtable John Quincy Adams. That former President, while a Member of the House, went to Calhoun's office in the State Department, confronted him with the lies Calhoun had used in his speeches and diplomatic dispatches; Adams told his diary on May 18, 1844: "He [Calhoun] writhed like a trodden rattlesnake on the exposure of his false report . . . and finally said that where there were so many errors they balanced one another!"

As for the lies that "balanced each other," as Calhoun said, they were of truly Nixonic proportions. Illustration will help show how significant a failing in the Fogel-Engerman work is its dependence upon the Census, particularly where Black people are concerned.

After Secretary of State Calhoun had used the data of the Census to inform the British government that they proved that where Black people were not slaves they "sank into vice and pauperism," while in slavery "they have improved in every respect," a convention of Black people appointed a committee of five, headed by Dr. James McCune Smith, to investigate the matter and report as to the facts. This committee stated it obviously could not investigate conditions among their brothers and sisters in the South but the accuracy of the data on them could be doubted on the basis of the falseness of the data concerning Black people in the North where investigation was possible and was carefully conducted. It was found, as to the latter, for example, that while according to the census data there were in eight named towns in Maine a total of 30 Black people who were insane, blind, deaf and mute, in fact there were no Black people in those towns at all; that this kind of falsification was practiced in town after town in New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan and Iowa, and that in the case of Worcester, Massachusetts, there were 133 patients in the mental institution, but these were all white and not Black as the census said![7]

The inadequacy of the post–Civil War censuses, especially up to 1890, was frequently affirmed by contemporaries; it was, for example, a matter of fierce debate between Dr. Du Bois and various racist "scientists." That of 1870—used by Fogel-Engerman uncritically—was especially defective in its undercounting of the Black population—the motive being to reduce their political power now that—with Reconstruction—they had been enfranchised.[8]

Indeed, the continued justified complaints as to the gross inaccuracy of the censuses, even during the modern period, especially pertaining to Black and Puerto Rican and Chicano people, is a matter of the widest public knowledge.[9]

It is clear, then, that any effort to determine statistically the conditions of slaves in the United States—assuming even the justification of a mathematical approach to such a question—a very large assumption, indeed—which is based upon the material in the United States Census is doomed to failure. This is true because such data are substantially of a different nature from period to period, are not fully extant for any of the pre–Civil War census years, are admittedly filled with the grossest kinds of errors in general, and

are notoriously erroneous in its data concerning Black people, who obviously are central to an investigation of slavery. In addition, one has not only these facts, but also clear proof that racism and the most patent and regressive political motivation were at work to help make the data concerning free Black people and slaves utterly untrustworthy.

Should investigators nevertheless decide that these data were of some use for this or that purpose, they would be compelled to explain why they thought so; *at the very least any serious scholar would be at great pains to let his readers know precisely how dubious were the data he was nevertheless using.*

Nothing remotely approaching this is done by Fogel and Engerman in their *Time on the Cross.* With such a failing—quite apart from everything else—it is only in a country whose "leading lights" give a Pulitzer Prize to Styron for his nightmare that one could have the same groups present *Time on the Cross* as not only a serious but a pathbreaking piece of scholarship!

NOTES

1. Robert W. Fogel and Stanley L. Engerman, *Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery,* Little, Brown, Boston, 1974, Vol. I, 286 pp.; Vol. II, *A Supplement,* tables and sources, 267 pp. The first volume is called the "primary" one; undoubtedly it will appear soon in paperback and it is the substantive work; therefore, comments will concentrate upon that volume. The authors are professors of economics at the University of Rochester.
2. Back in 1925, for example, Carter G. Woodson showed that census data affirmed that 3,635 Black people owned 12,488 slaves in the South as of 1830. A considerable portion of these—how many can no longer be ascertained—owned relatives and appeared as owners in the Census only because law forbade manumission. (This is in Woodson's *Free Negro Owners of Slaves in the United States in 1830* (Washington, 1925). I published an essay on buying freedom by slaves in *Opportunity* in June 1940; in expanded form this is in my book *To Be Free* [International Publishers, New York, 1948, pp. 31–40, 195–199].).
3. There is one exception to this and an exception itself highly

revealing of the specious character of the work, technically speaking. The Census of 1850 reported a rather high number of deaths of Black infants from suffocation. It is here—and only here—that our authors write that these data "might have been due to the jaundiced view of the overseers who reported the death statistics to the census takers" (p. 126). What about the "jaundiced" view of the census takers—and of the Census?

4. There is no history of the U.S. Census as a whole. The closest approximation is Carroll D. Wright, *The History and Growth of the United States Census,* prepared for the Senate Committee on the Census (Senate Document No. 194, 56th Congress, 1st session (serial no. 3856), U.S. Government Printing Office, 1900). See also Joseph A. Hill (Chief, Census Bureau), "The Historical Value of the Census Records" in *Annual Report,* American Historical Association, 1908 (Washington, 1909), I, pp. 199–208; Nahum Capen, *Letter Addressed to the Honorable John Davis Concerning the Census of 1850* (Washington, 1849); Frederick and Lois Mark, *Slavery and the Annexation of Texas* (New York, 1972), pp. 61–68, 85–92, 112–113, 117–120; H. Aptheker, *A Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States* (Citadel, 1951, Vol. I), pp. 238–243; J. A. Hazel, "Semi-microstudies of Counties from the Manuscripts of the Census of 1860," *Professional Geographer,* July 1965, pp. 15–19. None of the above sources is are mentioned in the Fogel-Engerman book.
5. In addition to lack of expertise and the "normal" carelessness characterizing racist behavior when touching Black people, a motive for underreporting existed for slaveowners—something never mentioned by Fogel-Engerman. This was the fact that though the tax system favored slaveowners, in several states, after 1840—due largely to demands of nonslaveholding whites—there was some tax reform and slave property was subject to fairly significant tax rates; hence, the less slaves, the less taxes!
6. In *Dictionary of American Biography,* 1943, Vol. 5, pp. 180–82.
7. This and much more will be found in the committee's report, published in Herbert Aptheker, cited work, Vol. I, pp. 238–243.
8. See, for example, Carroll Wright, cited work, p. 57; Charles E. Hall, *Negroes in the United States* (U.S . Government Printing Office, Washington, 1935), p. xvii. For references on Du Bois and the Census see my *Annotated Bibliography of the Published Writings of W. E. B. Du Bois* (Kraus Publishers, New

York, 1973), index under "extinction" and Hoffman, F. and Stone, Alfred.

9. Absurd underestimations of illiteracy, for example, of white, but especially of Black people, were discovered during World War II (see on this, my *Afro-American History: The Modern Era,* Citadel, pp. 202–212). The inaccuracy of the 1970 Census was made a matter of complaint by various local governments; the ridiculous underestimations of illiteracy in the census were reported in the *New York Times,* May 4, 1974.

HEAVENLY DAYS IN DIXIE: OR, THE TIME OF THEIR LIVES [II.]

Additional particulars concerning the figures in the book must be noted. Thus, on pages 124–25 there are statistics and tables which tell the unsuspecting reader what the life expectancy of slaves in the United States in 1850 was and how this compared with the life expectancies of white people in the United States. And there are figures on infant death rates, on suicides among slaves, on general morbidity and mortality rates, on incidence of death due to this or that cause, etc., and all this with figures suggesting not only an absence of doubt as to authenticity but exactitude—i.e., 177 per thousand, or 1.2 per cent, or one out of ten thousand, or 9.3 per cent of this or that or the other.

But the man who was in charge of the 1850 census complained of "the glaring weakness in the machinery for collecting data," and felt specifically that the data on mortality were "deplorably inadequate and inaccurate" and further stated that: "The total inadequacy of data on marriages, divorces, annulments, legitimacies, suicides and homicides . . . must be charged to the framers of the defective schedules."[1] Now, this has reference to the Census in general and to the data concerning white people; the data on Black people of course were infinitely worse than for white people. Yet here we have a "scientific" work that tells its readers down to a tenth of a decimal point how many slaves were sick or what was the rate of mortality or how many killed themselves!

The astonishing use of figures by these econometricians—and other habits astonishing for university professors—may be illustrated also in a section headed "The Myth of Slave-Breeding" (pp. 78–86). First we have the setting up of straw men:

> The thesis that *systematic* breeding of slaves for sale in the *market* accounted for a major share of the net income or profit of slaveholders, especially in the Old South, is espoused in one degree or another by most members of the anti-Phillips school.

This sentence is followed by the assertion that "evidence to sup-

port the contention of breeding for the market is meager indeed." And a few sentences further, one is told that the authors have not been able to find "a single authenticated case of the 'stud' plantations alleged in abolitionist literature."

Please note in all this: the italicized words *"systematic"* and *"market"* are the authors'; then that the result of this is supposed to constitute "a major share of the net income or profit of slaveholders" and then that the idea of such "breeding" for such purposes was not in the work of historians but in allegations of "abolitionist literature." And for all of this there is not a single footnote; might not the reader ask for one reference to a historian who reported the existence of stud farms and systematic breeding for a market and that the product of this "business" was a major source of the income of slaveowners? The words "espoused in one degree or another" will not do, of course; and the heading of this section is qualified in no way; it reads "The Myth of Slave-Breeding" and the commercial press has picked this up to convey the impression that the ravishment of Black women did not exist in slavery. (Fogel-Engerman say it did and did not, depending upon which page one reads!)

On one page (129) we find that: "Victorian attitudes predominated in the planting class. The emphasis on strong, stable families, and on the limitation of sexual activity to the family followed naturally from such attitudes"; but on page 85 we find that the authors affirm that they do not mean to say that there was "total absence of attempts at eugenic manipulation nor to deny the existence of masters who used slaves to give vent to their lust, or overseers who treated slave women under their control as if they were members of a harem, and of sons of slaveowners who seduced girls at extremely tender ages. No doubt such sexual abuses were encouraged by a legal system which not only deprived slave women of the right to legal remedy but sanctioned the right of slaveholders to manipulate the private lives of their chattel."

But go on again to another page (130) and we find now that what the authors mean to say is that "within the South, sexual exploitation by white men was not limited to black women" and that they doubt that "the degree of sexual exploitation which white men imposed on black women was greater than that imposed on white women." Ante-bellum critics of slavery assumed that it was greater, and accused the slaveowners of having kept, in fact, harems. Further, our authors write: "They assumed that because the law permitted slaveowners to ravish black women, the practice must have been extremely common. They also assumed that black women

were, if not more licentious, at least more promiscuous than white women, and hence less likely to resist sexual advances by men, whether white or black."

All of the above lacks even a single footnote. And the reader will please observe in the above sentences that our econometricians now are able to tell us with assurance what unnamed ante-bellum critics "assumed"; one wonders how these alleged assumptions were put into computers so that the certainty as to their existence and nature was achieved.

Who, among the Abolitionists (our authors always assume that they were all white, so we rephrase our question)—who among the white Abolitionists "assumed" or said or wrote that Black women were licentious and/or promiscuous? And when ante-bellum critics of slavery affirmed the ravishment of Black women—they did not assume it, I repeat, they affirmed it—they did so because they and everybody else who testified among contemporaries, including the slaveowners and especially their wives, knew this to be a reality. They knew it from the contemporary testimony of the thousands of slaves who escaped, including the women among them; and they knew it from court records, from newspaper reports, from admissions by the masters and their wives. They knew it from contemporary travelers; they knew it from the testimony of the very numerous southern whites who detested slavery, many of whom left the South and became active members of the Abolitionist movement, like the Grimké sisters from South Carolina and James Birney from Alabama and Elihu Embree from Tennessee and Levi Coffin from North Carolina.

They knew it from Frederick Douglass who stood before tens of thousands in the North as an escaped slave and explained that he knew not when he was born and knew not who his father was, but that he had known his mother and that while he fought like a lion against slavery his mother (and his sister) were slaves; plain people in the audiences in 1850 understood the meaning of this, even if professors in Rochester in 1974 cannot. They knew it when they heard the words and read the writings of dozens of other fugitive slaves, like William Wells Brown, who also knew not when he was born, but who did know the white man who had ravished his mother and sired him and who knew that his mother had had six other children and that the fathers were—as she told him—different men in every case. Brown knew his Black mother had been ravished repeatedly, but it never occurred to him that his mother was licentious or promiscuous; he only knew that she was a Black woman who worked and worked and worked, and who loved

him and was tender with him, and that she raised him to hate slavery and told him to flee whenever he could and who—when he said he could not leave without her—*ordered* him to do so and get out of hell.[2] Licentious, indeed!

These are elementary facts that any child past puberty should be able to understand; they fill ten thousand pages in ten hundred records of the slaves themselves—none of which made the Fogel-Engerman bibliography and none of which got into their computers.

Of course, contemporaries in the struggle against slavery knew that the wife of the fourth president of the United States had cried out: "We Southern ladies are complimented with the names of wives, but we are only the mistresses of seraglios." Mary Boykin Chestnut—wife of a leading South Carolina slaveowner—told in her diary with characteristic racist terminology of the torment faced by a woman in a household where the husband "runs a hideous black harem with its consequences under the same roof with his lovely white wife" and continued, "You see, Mrs. [Harriet Beecher] Stowe did not hit the sorest spot. She makes [Simon] Legree a bachelor."[3]

We have mentioned court cases; let us cite two which will throw some light on the reality of slavery—since in 1974 such light seems (again) needed. The time is 1859, the place is Mississippi. A Black man known only as Alfred has been sentenced to hang because he has killed a white man—"Coleman, the overseer." A defense is offered—Alfred and a slave woman named Charlotte thought of themselves as man and wife; Charlotte was forced to have intercourse with Coleman, and she told Alfred that and Alfred killed Coleman. But said the court, this was no valid defense for a slave; and Alfred was hanged. It is Virginia, 1830. Patrick faces death, for he has killed Peggy's master and he has killed the master because he—according to the contemporary records—kept Peggy confined, "by keeping her chained to a block and locked up in his meat house," and he did this because "Peggy would not consent to intercourse with him" and that Patrick killed him when the master tried to get him to restrain Peggy while he had intercourse with her. The contemporary records added a "detail"—neighbors were of the opinion that the master really was Peggy's father![4]

Can the reader take two more illustrations of the heavenly days in Dixie? Meet Edwin H. Fay, born in Alabama, educated in Harvard with two degrees from that illustrious university, headmaster of a boys' school in Minden, Louisiana and married and the owner of a number of slaves. Mr. Fay eagerly joins the Confederate Army to preserve this "way of life" and he regularly writes his wife—thoughtful chap that he is. One of his slaves was named

Cynthia and Sergeant Fay has learned that Cynthia has produced no children; he is therefore annoyed, as he writes his wife (on December 21, 1862) "because of her infertility" and therefore he writes Mrs. Fay—he writes his *wife!*—"Tell Cynthia if she does not have a *young one* . . . I intend to whip her almost to death." And, once more, on January 24, 1863:[5]

> Tell Cynthia that if she does not begin to show some signs that way when I come home that I'll either whip her most to death or sell her to the meanest man I can find on Red River. Be sure to tell her so, for I am not going to be fooled with her any longer. I bought her to breed and I know no good reason why she should not do it and she shall or I won't own her long.

That is towards the end of slavery and that is Louisiana. Now we are in 1784 and Virginia and not in the company of a schoolmaster of rather moderate means—a mere sergeant, but in the home of George Washington, the first officer of the Army, in temporary retirement, not long before he becomes the first President of the United States. He and Mrs. Washington are entertaining Baron von Steuben, who is accompanied by his young aide, Captain William North. The captain finds his stay boring, for there have been formal dinners and staid dancing, and this continues for a few days. The young captain writes a fellow officer, on March 9, 1784: "Will you believe it, I have not humped a single mulatto since I am here."[6] As Fogel-Engerman write—on one of their pages—during slavery "Victorian attitudes predominated in the planting class" and therefore "limitation of sexual activity to the family followed naturally from such attitudes." No doubt—but the "family" seems to have been quite extended!

But Fogel-Engerman are econometricians, so let us turn to their own use of figures to "prove" a relative absence of sexual exploitation of Black women during the years of slavery. First, the figures they offer deal only with what the census labelled "mulatto" and of course offspring suggest a fraction of the reality of sexual exploitation—a fact, again, that anyone past puberty (except, apparently, some professors) will understand.[7]

The key paragraph on this question—with all the numbers—from Fogel—Engerman (p. 132) is as follows:

> According to the 1860 census, 39 per cent of freedmen in southern cities were mulattoes. Among urban slaves the proportion of mulattoes was 20 percent. In other words, one out of

> every four Negroes living in a southern city was a mulatto. But among rural slaves, who constituted 95 percent of the slave population, only 9.9 percent were mulatto in 1860. For the slave population as a whole, therefore, the proportion of mulattoes was 10.4 per cent in 1860 and 7.7 per cent in 1850.

And then this: "The fact that during the twenty-three decades of contact between slaves and whites which elapsed between 1620 and 1850, only 7.7 per cent of the slaves were mulattoes suggests that on average only a very small percentage of the slaves born in any given year were fathered by white men."

In the above, the reader will please note the following: a) although the question being pursued is that of the sexual exploitation of Black women—and a high percentage of the free Black population had white fathers (according to their own figures)—this category is suddenly dropped, without a word, when final percentages are offered; b) while their own figures show 10.4 per cent as "mulatto" in 1860 and that is the final census year for slavery, Fogel-Engerman conclude the figures they offer readers with the percentage for 1850 and then say that "only 7.7 per cent" etc.; c) Fogel-Engerman go back to 1620 to get their "twenty-three decades" of contact, when as a matter of fact there is no slavery of any statistical consequence at all until about 1690 and none of real socio-economic consequence until 1710. Thus, what they are really writing about is not "twenty-three decades" but rather fourteen decades. And the realities of sexual exploitation not only cannot be exposed in terms of births but they certainly cannot be exposed in terms of births "in any given year," for such figures deal, obviously, just with *one year;* and the figures in any case come entirely from the census and we have already shown what such figures mean in general and as pertaining to Black people in particular. All these realities are intensified when it comes to the question here being investigated by Fogel-Engerman because, please remember, the census-takers are white men who question only white men. Indeed, when one recalls that and bears in mind how sensitive a matter this was in terms of the question of slavery (then the most burning political question), it is rather remarkable that so high a figure as Fogel-Engerman report does exist.

We are still not through with these scientific econometricians, for they do not make clear—or rather, they distort—what was meant by "mulatto" in the census. Fogel-Engerman write that: "Under common definition, a person with one-eighth ancestry of another race was a mulatto." But when one asks where that "common

definition" was discovered there is no answer. It certainly was not the definition in the census; the census takers were simply instructed to put down "color" and under that they could place the word "mulatto" but how this or that census taker talking to this or that slaveowner in this or that county of this or that state in this or that year determined this category was (and is) anybody's guess.

One might add that down to the modern era, state laws have varied in defining "Negro" so that who was so called in Indiana differed from one in Georgia, and in Georgia from one in Virginia. And the definition of a "Negro" in Virginia in 1930 was different from 1910. Since the whole concept of "race" is madness, efforts at definition reflect the insanity. This being the situation in the twentieth century, one has some idea of the accuracy of 1850 and 1860 census figures on "mulatto."[8] It is these figures that these "scientists" use with straight faces and from which they offer readers figures down to a tenth of a decimal point to bolster nonsense about Victorian moral standards back on the Old Plantation!

Still, we are not finished with this. For on page 133 of this opus one reads: "Measurements of the admixture of 'Caucasian' and 'Negro' genes among southern rural blacks today indicate that the share of Negro children fathered by whites on slave plantations probably averaged between 1 and 2 per cent."

Again, it is only those "fathered" who are cited and now our figures of 10.4 and 7.7 per cent have given way to one or two percent. And what are these "measurements" to which Fogel-Engerman refer the reader? It is a paper by T. Edward Reed which appeared in *Science,* August, 1969; in this paper Professor Reed suggested that *"if* certain strict criteria were met" (italics in original), it might be possible to estimate "the Caucasian contribution to American negro ancestry" and he then went on to indicate what these criteria are and then stated "that none of these criteria has been shown to be fully met" and to admit that in addition to the considerations that occurred to him "other sources of error may also exist."

This article generated correspondence—not indicated in Fogel-Engerman —from E. N. Anderson, Jr., an anthropology professor, who pointed out such minor failures in Professor Reed's paper as its neglect to define the population he included as "American Negro," since this differed from place to place, and that the phenomenon of "passing" had been ignored and that it had been suggested that "most Americans with African ancestry are 'white'." Professor Reed, in his reply, said that he had done his work in Oakland, California, that he depended on responses from women in-

terviewed for selection of people tested,—that, if he was told the background was "mixed," he did "not use" such people in his study (!) and that he was sure the "other difficulties" mentioned by Professor Anderson were "minor" "after discussion with colleagues"—in the University of Toronto![9]

Dear reader, please now go back and read the sentence from page 133 of Fogel-Engerman with the 1 per cent and 2 per cent and see on what that is based. And on this basis is denied and dismissed the travail that W. E. B. Du Bois said he would "never forgive" in his never-to-be-forgotten essay on "The Damnation of Women" in *Darkwater* (1920).

All this in the name of "science." If this is science at the University of Rochester, we will soon have opened there a Department of Astrology. Or better, perhaps the physicist, Shockley, will be invited there to head its genetics department.

After such shoddiness, it is almost hilarious to note with what contempt Fogel-Engerman dismiss the pioneering work of Frederic Bancroft in his *Slave Trading in the Old South*—a book so good that only an unknown publisher in Baltimore could be found to issue it back in 1931. This book, we are assured (p. 51), while claiming massive evidence in terms of the consequence of the trade, the reality of auctions, the sale of children, the separation of families, actually is "very fragmentary and extremely weak."

As struggle forced something of the consequence of Afro-American history into the mainstream of the U. S. history profession, the Bancroft book was reissued in 1959 with an introduction by Allan Nevins. The present writer—who did his early graduate work some forty years ago with the late Professor Nevins—had sharp differences with him as the years went by and made those differences public. But there is one thing neither I nor any other historian ever doubted as to Nevins and that was his technical competence and especially his grasp of the nature of evidence—which he taught all graduate students at Columbia for a generation. It is Nevins in this 1959 introduction to Bancroft who notes that on its subject his book "presented the complete facts" and "in so doing dissipated the most important fables and illusions that Southerners had drawn across the face of slave-mongering."

The Bancroft book, far from being fragmentary and weak, represents enormous research and presents its evidence from scores of varying contemporary sources—all of them valid and self-indicting and fully persuasive. It contains hundreds of examples of the mass sales of tens of thousands of slaves—young and old, male and female, children and adults, family[10] and nonfamily. Thus:

"For sale; several likely Negro girls from 12 to 18 years, for cash" (1819); "a likely young woman about 16 years of age" (1819); "cash will be given for boys from 7 to 15 years old" (1805); "3 likely Negro women, one with a male child" (1820); "I want to purchase 10 or 12 negroes, chiefly young females" (1835); "for sale, a Negro woman with one or more children to suit the purchaser" (1835); in Petersburg, Virginia, a girl of ten years was sold for $1,151 (1859)—and so on and on for the whole damnable, atrocious, unspeakable business. For the authors of *Time on the Cross* to dismiss Bancroft is like the author of *The Tragic Era* dismissing Du Bois.

Fogel-Engerman quote Du Bois once in their work; this is Du Bois' review in 1918 of Phillips' *American Negro Slavery*. The quotation is accurate, so far as it goes, showing that Du Bois then denounced the racism that permeated Phillips' work. Of course in the present stage no one can possibly defend the disgusting and blatant chauvinism of Phillips but, as I have said, the essential picture of the institution of slavery and the response thereto of the slaves given by Phillips is that given by Fogel-Engerman. Therefore, in their work, they present Phillips as a very perceptive historian who asked new and significant questions and offered penetrating and still largely valid answers—despite his "unfortunate" and even vile racism![11] But the point of Du Bois' review was not simply to expose Phillips' racism in the abstract as it were; Du Bois in that review was making the point that Phillips' racism made it impossible for him to present an accurate picture of slavery. Indeed, Du Bois' summary of the Phillips book—its picture of healthy, well-housed, contented slaves whose interests were those of the masters and vice versa—is actually a summary of the Fogel-Engerman book. It is to *that* picture of the system of slavery that Du Bois basically objects and it is precisely this objection that Fogel-Engerman hide from their readers and in so doing libel Du Bois. It is Du Bois who sees the South evolving, given slavery, into "an armed and commissioned camp to keep Negroes in slavery and to kill the black rebel"—and that is the heart of Du Bois' estimate of the realities of the pre-Civil War South and of his people's reaction to enslavement—and that quotation is from the main historical work by him on the subject which is neither quoted nor cited by Fogel-Engerman.[12]

The Fogel-Engerman book copies Phillips in conveying the impression of slavery in the United States as a system in which slave and master formed a cooperative team of subordinate and dominant in which patriarchal concern for the former was logical and cruelty and maltreatment were aberrational and unusual.[13]

The picture is one that coincides not only with Phillips but also

with Fitzhugh's insistence that it was slavery and only slavery that could solve the class conflict—since under it capital and labor were one. Just as neoconservatism has tried to make all U.S. history one of conformity and complacency, and present-day U.S. society one devoid of significant social conflict, so the Fogel-Engerman work makes of slavery in the United States a system unmarked by contradiction and notable for its absence of conflict. Class conflict, however, has marked all preceding recorded history and this is certainly true of the United States in the past and in the present and this truth holds not only for those inhabitants of the United States who are "colorless" but also for all those who are "colored."

Indeed, specifically in the area of Black people, propaganda has developed in the past few years to the effect that all is well with them, that—as Banfield held—insistence upon the realities of racism and its oppressive effects was either obsolete or demagogic; hence the logic of Moynihan's "benign neglect." The Fogel-Engerman book projects both the generalized concept of placidity in the U. S. past and its "exceptionalism" and simultaneously bolsters the Banfield-Moynihan-Nixon insistence that ideas of special deprivation, exploitation and oppression as characterizing the position of the Afro-American people are nonsense. In that sense, *Time on the Cross* fits the needs and moods of dominant class interests in this country as neatly as did its ideological ancestor—*American Negro Slavery*—during the First World War.

Fitzhugh was wrong; slavery does not overcome class struggle; it incarnates it. The interests of slave and owner are diametrically opposed and therefore one resists and the other oppresses. The latter takes many forms—cajolery, demagogy, deception, divide-and-rule, informers, provocateurs, priestly religion, bribery; but the basic form is power—power of the whip, the bit, the jail, the gallows, the guns. Resistance, too, took many forms: flattery, apparent acquiescence, flight, poison, arson, sabotage, self-injury, conspiracy, insurrection. The forms were individual and collective; they sought self-affirmation, personal realization. They sought an end to the whip, to the ownership of body, to the illiteracy, to the indignity, to the pain—to belonging to another and being absolutely subject to his will. For a man this was awful; for a woman it was unspeakable and for each to know the suffering of the other and of the children was the supreme agony. That is what slavery was in the United States and because of it the Afro-American people did what all people in the past (and present) do when so subjugated—they fought back.

Fogel-Engerman deny the reality and the efficacy of the

resistance and even offer—from the safety of centuries up there in Rochester—some phrases suggesting incredulity that the resistance was so minor. They are ignorant and arrogant; and despite the ingenious and brutal system of control, that resistance was continual, massive and magnificent. Fogel-Engerman ignore the masters' fear but *they* felt that fear and it permeated the slave society. Fogel-Engerman ignore the system of control, but the masters knew they needed it and therefore they built it and financed and manned it; and the slaves faced up to it and conducted their struggle despite it—and not without very heavy cost to themselves—with thousands done to death and tens of thousands scourged.

The masters knew they needed the whip, the force, and they used both. It is not possible to read the diaries—for example of William Byrd and of Landon Carter—to read the court records—for example as assembled in Helen Catterall's monumental work and in that of James Hugo Johnston—and to read the slaveowners' own press and letters, without seeing that this master-class force and violence absolutely permeated the society. In the diary of Byrd—one of the richest Virginia slaveowners—the constant refrain is: "I beat Jenny"; "I beat Anama"; his wife "caused little Jenny to be burned with a hot iron"; (a slave pretends illness)—"I put a branding-iron on the place he complained of and put the bit on him"—ad infinitum, ad nauseum—but not in Fogel-Engerman! In the Carter diary, using the index, there are 72 different references to "punishment"—a euphemism for beatings of this sort. In one case, three men recently retaken after flight had been "severely whipped" and then put to "turning the dung . . . and I have been obliged to make them work in chains," says the Colonel.

It occurs to me that it would be a salutary exercise for Professors Fogel and Engerman to turn somebody's dung for a few hours in the heat of a Virginia summer—even without chains; their computers would be less inaccurate.

Of course, with Fogel-Engerman as with Phillips, one finds a denial of resistance, but it must be said that our two modern professors plumb depths that the less sophisticated Phillips did not reach. Thus, one reads that those who have insisted that slaves managed to resist have only been "able to conjure up a handful of abortive conspiracies and ineffectual attempts at 'day-to-day resistance.' Thus Blacks were made to be failures even at resistance." And they continue—without shame—

> While white America produced heroes of the struggle against tyranny who were honest, courageous and industrious, the refurbished interpretation offered black rebels whose greatest

> achievements were such proficiency at stealing, shirking responsibilities, and feigning illness—and who were possessed of such sly capacity for lying—that they could trick their masters into believing they were contented. (p. 259)

As I say, even Phillips with all his overt racism and his distortions and omissions never permitted himself to publish that kind of almost unbelievable falsification and defamation. Needless to say, Fogel-Engerman have no references for this filthy paragraph. Are these, then, the characteristics of the heroes and heroines of Black history? Do these describe Cato of Stono, who led his scores of comrades in a glorious crusade for freedom in South Carolina; do these describe the blacksmith Gabriel, slave of Prosser in Virginia, and his thousands of followers with their banners inscribed "Liberty or Death," some of whom Governor James Monroe interviewed and of whom he said they are lovers of liberty and will yield no names of those we seek; are these the characteristics of Denmark Vesey, himself free, who talked of liberty and whom thousands followed and died on the gallows; of Nat Turner, chained to a Virginia prison and questioned by the master's court and, urged to confess his mistake and to acknowledge his failure, hurls to the face of the questioner the question: "Was not Christ crucified?"; is this true of Frederick Douglass, who escaped on his third try, whose head was smashed by proslavery mobs, who fought like a lion for his people's freedom and the enhancement of the United States (and whom President Lincoln called "the most meritorious man in the nation"); does this hold for Harriet Tubman who went back into the heart of slavery time after time, with a reward on her head (what a patriarchal society to offer a reward for a woman's head!) and led to freedom hundreds of slaves?

Sometimes one is led to the point of near-despair when he reads books like *Time on the Cross,* by relatively young professors, and sees how they are hailed and their book pushed and advertised and reviewed; a book that is as false, as contrived, as vicious, as is this one. But, of course, one knows that it is only a dying social order that needs and produces and praises such books—just as that of Calhoun and Jefferson Davis needed the work of Fitzhugh.

From Fitzhugh's *Sociology for the South* to Appomattox was a dozen years; how long will it be from *Time on the Cross* to the time of Jubilee?

NOTES

1. C. Skipper, *J. D. B. De Bow*, University of Georgia Press, Athens, 1958, pp. 76, 78–79. It is noted here (p. 80) that proposals for improving the 1860 census were"ignored." De Bow is identified in the first part of this essay. For an additional reference on the unreliability of the Censuses through 1870, see W. S. Holt, *The Bureau of the Census*, Brookings Institute, Washington, 1929, pp. 13,16, 18, 20.
2. The black scholar, William Edward Farrison, produced a first-rate biography, *William Wells Brown: Author and Reformer*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1969.
3. Harriet Martineau, *Society in America*, London, 1837, 2 vols., II, p. 38; Ben Ames Williams, ed., *The Diary of Mary Boykin Chestnut*, Boston, 1949, p. 122. William Gilmore Simms, a leading Southern writer, while defending slavery in a book published in 1852 said that Martineau's depiction of the ravishment of the female slave was "full of truth." (*Pro-Slavery Arguments*, p. 228).
4. See James Hugo Johnston, *Race Relations in Virginia and Miscegenation in the South, 1776–1860*, University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst, 1970, pp. 306–309. The late Professor Johnston's book was written as a dissertation in 1937 but was not published for over thirty years. Scholars in the area of slavery, however, knew of it and used it. It is a classical work based on archival study; even with its publication and easy availability, it is not cited by Fogel-Engerman. Needless to say, this splendid work received no recognition from the *New York Times* and the *Wall Street Journal* also has somehow overlooked it.
5. Bell I. Wiley and Lucy E. Fay, eds., *'This Infernal War': The Confederate Letters of Sgt. Edwin H. Fay*, University of Texas Press, Austin, 1958, p. 6. This book also fails to appear in the elaborate reference volume prepared by Fogel-Engerman. The editors of this book, in their introduction, remark: "Fay seems to have subscribed wholeheartedly to prevailing Southern views about slavery . . . ."
6. Quoted from manuscripts in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania in James T. Flexner, *George Washington and the New Nation, 1783–1793*, Little Brown, Boston, 1970, p. 24.
7. By the way, in terms of "mixed offspring," Fogel-Engerman ignore the whole matter of white mothers and Black fathers;

by no means uncommon even in the days of slavery. Benjamin Banneker is a well-known instance. The Johnston book previously cited has much data on this. The full meaning of this—for example, in terms of women's resistance—has not yet been investigated.

8. See this writer's pamphlet, *America's Racist Laws* (1951), pp. 12–13 and sources therein cited.
9. *Science,* December 12, 1969. The quotation on "passing"is from an essay by R. P. Stuckert in P. Hammond, ed., *Physical Anthropology* (1964), pp. 192–197.
10. On family, Thomas J. Flexner is correct when he writes: "It was common for slave owners to discourage permanent marriages among blacks as creating complications in the mobility of individual slaves. A family was defined as a mother and her children. Washington adhered for a considerable time to this conventional attitude"—*George Washington: Anguish and Farewell (1793–*1799), Boston, 1972, p. 441. Black women under slavery struggled fiercely to maintain a sense of family; and men, though slaves, fought hard on this front. No one has yet told this great story. In the Black culture, more than the white, "mother" was the woman who tended the children—there may or may not have been a biological connection.
11. Du Bois is quoted on pages 223–224; in the supplemental volume however, Du Bois is quoted as admiring Phillips' "labor and research"—and Woodson also is made to hail "the fruitfulness of Phillips' methodological innovations." (II, pp. 177–178.) This distorts the positions of both men.
12. Du Bois' review of Phillips appeared in the *American Political Science Review,* November 1918. The quotation is from his *Black Reconstruction* (1935), p. 12. Phillips was no remote scholar; he was actively advocating a return to forced labor for Black people. As he wrote in *South Atlantic Quarterly* (1903, 2: 231–236), "The Georgia convict farm serves as an example." And his *American Negro Slavery* (1918) was as much a part of the wartime racist-reactionary drive as *Birth of a Nation* (1915) and the revived KKK. Du Bois had previously attacked this aspect of Phillips whom he denounced for "adroitness in bolstering up bad cases" (*The Crisis,* March 1913).
13. I do not have the space to deal with the Fogel-Engerman insistence upon the economic "efficiency" of the slave system. Their data here, as everywhere in their work, are highly dubious and their dismissal of the findings of people like

Olmsted and Cairnes and even Helper is too sweeping. Moreover, they ignore the reportage of innumerable visitors, especially from Europe, and the criticisms of the slave economy by many leading Southerners, including even De Bow. Basic is the fact that there is a vast difference between a system profitable to the rulers and a *socially* efficient one—witness the economy of Iran or Brazil—or the United States! The theoretical implications of the allegedly "progressive" and efficient character of a slave economy are significant; that experts in the United States are now heralding slavery on these grounds is as ominous as it is erroneous.

RACISM AND COUNTERREVOLUTION

On a global scale, the imperialist policy of subverting socialist societies and defeating national liberation movements has been basic to Washington's conduct for half a century. A central rationalization from this policy of counterrevolution has been racism; the latter was more easily and more effectively employed since it had been at the heart of the rationalizations for the genocidal policy pursued toward the American Indian peoples, for the African slave trade and for the enslavement of African-derived peoples in the United States – as well as for preimperialist, "Manifest Destiny" exhibitions, such as the war against Mexico.

A prime illustration of rampant racism in the service of counterrevolution is afforded by the history of the post-Civil War decade in the United States, generally known as the Reconstruction era. The main weapon created and employed by reaction in this instance was the Ku Klux Klan. Up to this moment there has been no adequate history of the KKK. Allen W. Trelease's *White Terror: The Ku Klux Klan Conspiracy and Southern Reconstruction* (Harper and Row: New York, 1971, 605 pp.) is not yet that adequate history, but it is the best book on the subject to date and it helps very much in preparing the way for the masterwork that yet awaits the writing.

In the 1960's as part of the breakaway from the Neo-Conservaism of the McCarthyite era, younger historians began to publish significant studies of the KKK; especially important were those by Otto H. Olsen and W. McKee Evans on North Carolina, Herbert Shapiro on South Carolina, Ralph L. Peek on Florida and – especially important for the Trelease book – John A. Carpenter's "Atrocities in the Reconstruction Period" which appeared in *The Journal of Negro History* in October, 1962. These works are properly credited by Trelease in the 110 pages he devotes to references and bibliography; absolutely extraordinary, however, is his failure to mention or to cite at any point the work of W. E. B. Du Bois. That this could happen in 1971 and pass the readers and editors at Harper and Row is one of those events that could happen "only in America."

The weakest section of Trelease's book is its forty-page introduction and especially his pages on the institution of slavery and the

response thereto of the slaves. Here his acceptance of the alleged docility of the slaves is not only false but helps vitiate the main body of his volume, for there he reiterates the idea that the Black masses were rather easily subdued during Reconstruction and that they did not actively resist the forces of reaction, including the KKK. Although, as I shall show, the data he himself brings forth show significant resistance, the chauvinist assumptions with which he began his work inhibit it throughout; actually what especially remains to be done now that Trelease has chronicled rather fully the barbarous atrocities committed by the KKK is *to search out and to present fully the record of resistance to the Bourbon and the KKK offered by some whites and enormous numbers of Blacks in the South.* (Although the latter was not the main focus, of course, of Du Bois' 1935 classic, knowledge of its presence permeates that work, as it does the 1937 book on Reconstruction by the Marxist, James S. Allen, also not mentioned by Trelease.)

One should add that the positive features of Reconstruction, which Trelease summarizes, appear in the paper Du Bois gave to the American Historical Association back in 1909 and that Du Bois published a characteristically penetrating essay directly on the KKK in the *North American Review* in 1926 that Mr. Trelease has ignored at his (and his readers') cost.

Albion W. Tourgée, the white radical Reconstructionist, writing of Trelease's "white terror," said in his *A Fool's Errand* (1879): "Of the slain there were enough to furnish forth a battlefield and all from these three classes, the Negro, the scalawag and the carpetbagger. . . . The wounded in this silent warfare were more thousands than those who groaned upon the slopes of Gettysburg." Du Bois, in his *Black Reconstruction*, correctly indicated the dimensions of the violence when he spoke of it as constituting "a civil war of secret assassination and open intimidation and murder."

The fact is that commencing in 1865 and continuing for about twelve or thirteen years, there was a systematic and organized counterrevolutionary war led by the southern oligarchy whose purpose was to thwart the fulfilling of the bourgeois-democratic revolution commenced with the abolition of slavery as a result of the Civil War. That oligarchy sought to hold the social order as near its ante-bellum status as it could. For this purpose it sought to undo the extension of the suffrage, the establishment of a viable educational system, the undercutting of institutionalized racism and the effort to eliminate the plantation system. Its ideology was elitist and—above all—racist; its method ranged from bribery to demagogy to deceit; its trump card was the basic sympathy uniting the

major propertied interests of the North and of the South; and its main weapon was the atrocious terrorism of the KKK.

Trelease's book details the terrorism; it does so month by month and area by area, concluding somewhat prematurely with the beginning of 1873. Grant's Attorney General, Amos T. Akerman (who had lived in Georgia since 1840, had supported the Confederacy, became a Republican in Georgia after the war and entered the Cabinet in June, 1870 and seems to have been the only member of the Cabinet who took the KKK seriously) wrote in November 1871, after having toured much of the South: "I doubt whether from the beginning of the world until now a community, nominally civilized, has been so fully under the domination of systematic and organized depravity."

Trelease is surely correct when he notes that, "Until recently, most historians of Reconstruction . . . made it palatable by ignoring, evading, or denying the greater substance of Klan activity" (p.18). Though the KKK in its own printed announcements affirmed that it sought only to assist Confederate widows and orphans and to support Christian ideals and establish "law and order," in fact, as Trelease writes, it "pandered to men's lowest instinct; it bullied or brutalized the poor, the weak, and the defenseless; it was often the embodiment of lawlessness and outrage; it did almost nothing to succor Confederate widows and orphans; and it set at defiance the Constitution and laws of the United States"(p.17).

The KKK tortured cripples, mass-raped children, lynched thousands, whipped women, burned churches, schools and homes, mutilated men. There is nothing the Nazis did in Poland or in the Ukraine which the KKK did not do in Alabama and Mississippi and Louisiana; and the casualties within the United States numbered in the tens of thousands. All this must be known—not in general but in detail—before one can understand the full horror of the indictment Trelease offers against American "scholarship" when he correctly writes that this is what most historians have made palatable to generation after generation of Americans. The seeds of My Lai have indeed been planted deeply.

In the South as a whole the Blacks were outnumbered by about two to one; they were about 90 per cent illiterate; they were almost all without land or other means of support except their own labor power; they were not widely armed and those who were armed did not have these arms, generally speaking, for long periods; they lacked horses and so suffered in comparison with groups like the KKK in terms of mobility; and they never got the real and sustained and vigorous support of the federal government. In the

face of all this and the fanatical hostility of the planters and propertied classes—and the promises of the federal government and the Republican Party, which for some time deceived many of the Blacks—the resistance put up by the Afro-American people to the forces of reaction and Bourbonism is really remarkable.

Trelease thinks the record is not one of resistance; he writes a dozen times of the Black population as having been "cowed." Yet the narrative, the facts, the story which he tells is—despite him—filled with resistance. Specific instances commence on page 31 where we are told that in Tennessee in 1868 Blacks stood and fought back against a KKK attack, killed one and wounded four and forced the rest to flee, and they terminate on page 468 where another example of armed resistance by Blacks (again in Tennessee) to KKK assaults is given. To indicate the dimensions of this I think it is necessary to cite the pages in Trelease's book where instances of actual physical resistance by Blacks to the KKK are noted; 34, 38, 70, 95, 106, 117, 123, 125, 153, 177–78, 190, 194, 207, 208, 229, 243, 250, 269, 280, 282, 289, 290, 304, 312, 337, 351, 364, 367 (the text ends on page 422).

I repeat that this is in a book whose author labors under Elkins-like illusions of "docility" and seeks not to describe resistance but rather to describe KKK terrorism. Resistance during slavery makes up a great chapter in the panorama of human struggle; in Afro-American history there is a crying need for intense study of all available sources—and especially those coming from Black people—on the story of resistance after the Civil War.

Mr. Trelease is somewhat ambivalent in his attitude as to what course might have been pursued to combat KKK terrorism. He writes:

> To arm the Negroes against a large proportion of the white population would surely have embittered race relations for more than was already the case, and precipitated a race conflict of incalculable consequences. Governor [William H.] Smith [of Alabama] naturally, and probably wisely, refused to risk such a conflagration. Like other deep South governors in these circumstances in the months and years to come, he refused to organize a militia, and the Klan in Alabama continued to grow almost unchecked (p. 88).

From Mr. Trelease's own description of conditions it is not easy to understand how anything at all—let alone arming the Black population—could have further "embittered race relations"; on the basis of racism, hundreds were being murdered and thousands

wounded in Alabama and peonage was being instituted and schools and churches were being burned and Black and white leaders of democratic government were being exterminated. Moreover, Trelease himself shows that where and when—as in Tennessee and Arkansas in the late 1860's—the anti-Bourbon and anti-KKK forces (Black and white) were armed and were given state support in their efforts to resist reaction, they were successful and something approaching peaceful and civilized conditions did prevail. Thus, for example, we read:

> It seems very clear now as it did then that the militia campaign [made up of black and white men] was directly responsible for disrupting the Klan and restoring peace throughout most of Arkansas. Governor [Powell] Clayton's calculated risk had paid off. As a result he accomplished more than any other southern governor in suppressing the Ku Klux conspiracy (p. 174).

Indeed, Trelease's ambivalence is shown by such statements as these: "The Radical governments made no effort to outlaw the Conservative opposition or create a dictatorship. On the contrary, they were too lenient in enforcing law and order against those who used force to overthrow them." Again: "The greatest short-run deficiency of the Republican regimes—it would prove fatal—was their physical weakness." And yet again: "Radical regard for the civil liberties of ex-Confederates enabled the latter to sabotage the Reconstruction program almost from the start" (pp. xxix, xxxiv, xxix). Well then, if there were examples of effective suppression of the KKK, and it is true that in general, however, Radical governments were "too lenient" and if this was "the greatest short-run deficiency" which was to "prove fatal," why did those who adopted the "too lenient" course which "proved fatal" to the defense of democratic and anti-racist government in the South, "probably act wisely"?

On the contrary, part of the counterrevolutionary reality was not only the KKK in the dead of the night but also the governors and sheriffs and senators in the face of the day who evoked excuses for failing to act and in fact, by so failing, made possible the triumph of reaction and the continuance of the slaughter of the innocents. The lessons here for all revolutionary efforts and counterrevolutionary thrusts are clear; historically one of the central failures of forces of progress has been to underestimate the cruelty, cunning and perversity of reaction.

Here, too, reading Du Bois would have helped Trelease. In his

1935 volume, Du Bois pointed out: "If the Reconstruction of the Southern states, from slavery to free labor, and from aristocracy to industrial democracy, had been conceived as a major national program of America, *whose accomplishment at any price was well worth the effort,* we should be living today in a different world." No, one had to worry about the "civil liberties of ex-confederates" – like the slave-trading General Nathan Bedford Forrest (the Fort Pillow murderer), so that he could become Grand Wizard of the KKK, and owner of railroads. In slavery, slaveowners are free to own slaves; if one ends slavery he must terminate that freedom. In reconstructing society, the "civil liberties" of racist planters and KKK Bourbons mean in fact the killing of the hopes and dreams of the poor and the coming in to being of systems which breed governors like Wallace and army officers like Calley. Certainly, the experiences of mankind have shown that these choices are not simple and that their implementation carries great dangers; but the choices must be made and are made and one must not become paralyzed by them. If one does not act at all, if one does not decisively protect the power needed to really remake society, the effort will fail and the fearful suffering will not only continue and intensify but will all be in vain. This is another of the basic lessons from Reconstruction and another reason for the fantastic distortion to which that period has been subjected.

One of the positive features of the Trelease volume is that it buries the mythology which ascribed the murderous career of the KKK to poorer whites who "get out of control" and insisted that the wealthy had in mind only the most chivalrous purposes. He shows that the leadership came from the planters and bankers and merchants; that the guiding spirits were "composed of the wealthiest and most respectable elements" (p. 98). Professor Ralph L. Peek, in his already mentioned studies of the KKK in Florida, had affirmed ten years ago that "the younger men of the upper class made the night rides, waged a campaign of intimidation by beatings, floggings and murders" (*Florida Historical Quarterly*, October 1961, p.184).

There are, indeed, some data in the Trelease volume showing that the Republican Party inside the South during Reconstruction consisted of the mass of the Black population and very significant segments of the white population, especially those with little or no property and particularly, of course, in the Piedmont and mountain areas. In this sense, his narrative again contradicts the generalization in his own preface where he remarks that the era of Reconstruction "exemplifies" the assertion by Professor U. B. Phillips some forty years ago to the effect that the effort to maintain the South

as a "white man's country" was "the central theme of Southern history." This was the effort of the historical mythology—a main creator of which was Phillips; but the actual history is of the effort by the slaveowners and the Bourbons to maintain their power as opposed to separate—and sometimes joint—efforts by the exploited and oppressed, Black and white, to undo that power. The fact is that no era shows this more clearly than that of Reconstruction; this is, indeed, another reason why that period has been so systematically falsified.

Important in Trelease's book is its material on whites in the South—notably those born and raised there—who broke away from the dominant racist pattern and with great heroism—often the loss of their lives—tried to make their home a region of equality and fraternity. These people include the 18-year old Emerson Bentley of Louisiana, George W. Smith of Texas, Alonzo B. Corliss of North Carolina and Robert W. Flournoy of Mississippi. As Trelease correctly states, "Radicalism [in the Reconstruction South] was also aimed less spectacularly at raising the status of poorer whites. Within limits the Republican Party was a poor man's party [in that South] which sought to obliterate racial lines as much as popular prejudices made it politically safe to do"(p. xxviii). It was a Charleston, South Carolina newspaper, the *Daily Republican* (July 2, 1870), which attacked the idea of white supremacy and continued:

> Much talk is as wickedly idle as for colored men to say that their race shall have complete control. It is not to be a matter of race at all. It is to be a matter of citizenship, in which colored and white are to have their rights and their due share of power; not because they are white, not because they are colored, but because they are American citizens. By-and-by we shall stop talking of the color of a man in relation to citizenship and power, and shall look at his wealth of mind and soul.

That this could appear in a Charleston, South Carolina daily newspaper is another reason for the intense distortions to which Reconstruction has been subjected. *The story of Southern white opposition and resistance to chauvinist, oligarchic domination has hardly begun to appear; this would be a most worthy endeavor by a group of younger scholars seeking to forge fruitful lives.*

Trelease begins his book by stating that the KKK "became a counter-revolutionary device to combat the Republican party and Congressional Reconstruction policy in the South. For more than four years it whipped, shot, robbed, raped, and otherwise outraged

Negroes and [white] Republicans across the South in the name of preserving white civilization" (p. xi). *White Terror* is the most detailed and least equivocal record of the barbarism to appear in print; having produced this, Mr. Trelease has accomplished a great deal.

JOHN BROWN AND THE WRITING OF HISTORY

With the crushing of Reconstruction, the imposition of peonage upon the southern Black masses and the return of the South to Bourbonic domination—while rising industrial capitalism furthered its rape of the region and its inhabitants—the necessity arose, from an ideological viewpoint, for the undercutting of the grandeur of the Abolitionist movement and, especially, for the destruction of the symbol of the martyred John Brown.

An illustration of this process appears in the publication, in the October 1883 number of the *North American Review*—then a leading magazine—of an article on John Brown which denounced "deluded abolitionists" in general and which concluded, as to Brown himself:

> Surely such a man is not a proper hero for the youth of our country to worship, and we believe that as his true history, too long concealed, becomes known, admiration for him will be changed to disgust, and disgust to anger, that we have been so long deceived. (Vol. 137, p. 446.)

I remember vividly the late Dr. Carter G. Woodson, the great pioneer in Afro-American history, telling me that in his Harvard days, prior to the First World War, his professor, Edward Channing, remarked that he could never think of John Brown without experiencing intense anger and a desire to strangle the Old Man—yet again.

What is the reason for this? It is because in John Brown one had a white man, prior to the Civil War, who consciously sought to overcome and succeeded in overcoming chauvinism. It is because one had a man who understood that the greatest single danger to the wholesome condition of and future for U.S. society lay in the enslavement of Black people; that the enslavement vitiated the freedom of the masses of other peoples; that its excision was necessary if the Republic were to survive; that the success of its elimination required Black and white unity based not upon philanthropy but upon comprehension of the mutual necessity for such unity if the interests of both were to be secured. It is because in John Brown

one had a man who condemned government that in addition to being racist and slaveocratic also, naturally, was elitist in general and specifically favored the rich over the poor; in John Brown one had a man who stated quite explicitly that he did what he did because he was partisan for those who were exploited and oppressed, those who were impoverished and that in acting for them he did what was right and not what was wrong and that if his life had to be forfeited for such an effort—so be it—he went gladly to the gallows being sure that his position would be vindicated in the unrolling of history. This question of the enslavement of Black people is what brought me here, he told the Virginia court; you will be able to finish with me quickly—I am old and wounded and in chains and you will hang me and that will finish with me. But the question that brought me here—this question of a Republic enslaving people, of the land of the Declaration of Independence persisting in the retention of millions of men, women and children in the condition of cattle, that question is the question of questions for this guilty land and *that* you will not be able to settle so quickly. But until that question is settled and settled right—i.e., settled so that fraternity and equality mark this land—until that is settled nothing will be settled and the torment of this country will continue and deepen.

That is what the Old Man said in the most remarkable extemporaneous speech in defense of his course that any political prisoner, facing execution, ever delivered in the history of the United States.

He not only said these things and believed these things, but he acted them out; he led in the freeing of slaves from Missouri—taking them eleven hundred miles through the dead of winter into Canada. He fought tooth and nail the slaveocracy and its gangsters in Kansas and gave blow for blow until his name became a terror and a warning to the minions of slavery. And he led the great effort at Harper's Ferry to arouse a guilty nation, to attempt the setting up of guerilla centers in the Blue Ridge Mountains, reaching down from Virginia into Alabama and so offering hope to the enslaved and terror to the slavemasters.

He did these things when, in his genius, he knew that the time had come, that the country was ripe, that the world was ready, that the Abolitionist movement had been educated up to the point of appreciating the need for and the right of resistance to the force and violence of the slaveowners and that therefore that movement would understand that his effort was not an individualistic one, not aberrational, but collective and logical and inevitable.

Above all, Brown's effort was a Black-white effort. Brown had sought to burn out chauvinism and he had done so with the help of Black people who recognized his integrity and loved him for his beauty and courage. Wherever he went he sought out Black people—in the West, in Rochester, in Brooklyn, in Canada, in New England. He *spoke* freely and fully to them, *listened to them*, and acted in accordance with their suggestions. At times, some among them disagreed—for very good reasons—as in the celebrated case of Frederick Douglass; but there, too, the discussion was long and fraternal and when the men parted they parted in love, both crying and each kissing the other. There, listening, was the young fugitive from South Carolina, Shields Green, who had but recently made it to freedom and when Douglass turned to go he found Green remaining behind and said to him, "Shields, are you not coming?" and Green answered with the only words history records from him: "No, I believe I'll go with the old man." He did and fought with him and was hanged with him. Can one imagine a more dramatic demonstration of Black-white unity, a more dramatic exposition of the greatness of Brown and the nobility of the people for whom and with whom he gladly died?

So, the slave state of Virginia hanged Brown—and hanged him with rope made from slave-grown cotton, so that he dangled alive for some ten minutes. He had been captured in an onslaught led by Robert E. Lee, and watching his execution was Edmund Ruffin, slavocracy's leading ideologist, who was to have the "honor" of firing the first round against Fort Sumter. And with him in the thousands of armed guards at the execution was John Wilkes Booth, who was to murder Abraham Lincoln—shortly after Lee had surrendered to Grant and after Ruffin, having learned of the surrender, wrapped his head in the stars and bars of the Confederacy and belatedly blew his damned brains out.

The men who bested Lee and his proslavery armies were Black and white and they marched into battle with the name of Old John Brown upon their lips. And when the flag of the United States was once again hoisted above Fort Sumter, it was William Lloyd Garrison who put it back—the same Garrison whom a proslavery mob had very nearly lynched in the streets of Boston thirty years before.

That is a taste of the story of John Brown—and unmentioned was his tenderness, his love of children, unmentioned—and not yet sufficiently caught in any book in print—is the magnificence of Mary Brown. Some day someone will write a book devoted to her and will do justice to that life and above all to that scene where at

her insistence and over the objections of John (who feared he would break) she visited him the day before he was hanged and talked with him for hours and comforted him and discussed their children. And the book will tell, too, how Mary remained and persuaded the Governor of Virginia to let her take the bodies of her two sons and her John back with her to the Adirondacks to be buried among their Black neighbors. What a book that will be!

Meanwhile, we have a great book; it is Volume One of Richard Boyer's *John Brown.*[1] To this story Richard Boyer devoted some seventeen years and they were well spent. When Dr. Du Bois published his life of Brown, in 1909, he apologized for producing "yet another" such work. Three generations having passed and a score more biographies having appeared—and some, as those by Oswald Garrison Villard, Stephen B. Oates and Barrie Stavis, of great value—should one expect from Mr. Boyer an apology for "yet another"?

I think not; for Richard Boyer is correct when he writes that Brown was "central to the most anguished and most significant of all American experiences"; that he represented "the climax of a long agony." It is not possible to have too many studies of such a figure; and our own time—surely also "a long agony"—constantly needs to examine so seminal and monumental a character as this martyr.

Happily, in Mr. Boyer one has a consummate journalist who also produced in the past a good biography (of Max Steuer, 1932), a good history of the maritime industry and its workers *(The Dark Ship,* 1947), and—with the late Herbert Morais—a splendid account of *Labor's Untold Story* (1955).

The especially distinguishing feature of Boyer's *Brown*—which has appeared only rarely in the historical literature—is its demonstration that the Old Man, far from being unique, was representative of the deepest currents of his time and that this explains not only the person but also his decisive impact upon the nation. The book also emphasizes (as Du Bois did so well) the influence of Black people upon Brown and his success in cleansing himself of racism.

The persistent charge of insanity made against John Brown reflects upon the society and the historians who would find insanity in any person who rejected the enslavement of Black people and gave his life in the successful effort to destroy that monstrosity. In a society so polluted it is those who sustain it or excuse it who are the "insane" and those who detest it and struggle against it who are sane. The falsification of evidence on this point—to which such eminent historians as Allan Nevins and C. Vann Woodward have

slipped (as Stephen B. Oates and Louis Ruchames in particular demonstrated in earlier works)—reflects the continued needs of a racist society. On this point, Boyer aptly remarks:

> The question persists, however, that if John Brown were mad, what were Emerson and Thoreau and Frederick Douglass, Theodore Parker, Wendell Phillips, and other great Americans still honored for significant accomplishment. Who gave some of their money and all of their honor not to John Brown's plan but also to their belief in his integrity and judgment? (p.138.)

Boyer's writing is magnificent and proves again that history and biography are forms of *literature.* Since the work is expansive and one of its main efforts is to place its subject in his era, one finds here notable character sketches of John Quincy Adams, William Walker, Edmund Ruffin, Theodore Parker, William L. Yancey, Henry S. Wise and others, written with the verve to be expected from the author who made the "profile" section of *The New Yorker* such a joy for a dozen years.

This volume takes Brown to Kansas, four years before he was hanged; a concluding volume will tell the story from the Kansas struggle to the moment when the Old Man—to quote Victor Hugo—made "the gallows as glorious as the Cross." If Richard Boyer can sustain, in his second volume, the level and depth and passion of this first one, he will have produced a work worthy of its subject.

Some suggestions on the John Brown literature may be of service. In 1962 International Publishers issued a new edition of the 1909 biography of Brown by Dr. Du Bois. In reviewing that edition at the time, Mr. Ernest Kaiser of the Schomburg Collection of the New York Public Library included his characteristically incisive bibliographical guide to the subject as of 1962; this appears in *Freedomways*, Summer 1963 (III, 446–50). Since 1962, in addition to Boyer's work, readers should note the following:

> Truman Nelson, *The Old Man: John Brown at Harper's Ferry,* (Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York, 1973, 360 pp.); a powerful evocation of the drama of Brown's last period.
>
> Stephen B. Oates, *To Purge This Land With Blood: A Biography of John Brown,* (Harper & Row, New York, 1970, 434 pp.); contains fifty pages of notes and a listing of leading manuscript sources. It is written in the vein of Villard's work—massive, "academic," eschewing analysis, generally accurate.

Benjamin Quarles, ed., *Blacks on John Brown*, (University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1972, 164 pp.); a unique collection, plus three-page guide to aspects of Brown history.

Barrie Stavis, *John Brown: The Sword and the Word*, (A.S. Barnes & Co., New York, 1970, 190 pp.); analytically, very perceptive and with an eight-page annotated, good bibliography.

(Ten days after writing the above, the shattering news came of the sudden death of Mr. Boyer. His life was a full and noble one; to have been able to leave this interpretation of John Brown, even though not finished, is a fitting memorial to the splendor of Dick Boyer's own life.)

NOTES

1. Richard O. Boyer, *The Legend of John Brown: A Biography and a History*, (Knopf: New York, 1973, 622 pp.)

SOUTHERNERS ON SOUTHERN HISTORY

The very epitome of The Myth is "the South." First, the South as homogeneous—allegedly Anglo-Saxon, with those whites having other national origins neglected and the Black people ignored; and the ignoring of the Afro-Americans as human beings, decisive to the South, was central to the content of the Myth. Second, having in mind now the white South, presenting it as monolithic; monolithic not only in terms of being Anglo-Saxon but also socially placid, nonantagonistic, united. Third, the South as paternalistic, and here the Black entered—as a half-formed child, as an object, as a "burden," as a "problem," best handled by those who "understood," who really "cared," his "best friends." Fourth, the South as chivalrous (again, of course, this ignored Black women) with a special regard for (white) women whose delicacy, "purity," selfless devotion and ethereal quality were not merely sublime but quite divine.

Afro-Americans for centuries have exposed the Myth for the fantastic lie it has been and is; without a peer in the massiveness and effectiveness of this effort was, of course, the late Dr. Du Bois. Southern whites, too, in significant numbers have developed a literature of exposure and condemnation; an anthology of such writings through the generations would have great value and an analytical and descriptive volume devoted to that literature is urgently needed.

In the present period we are witnessing the accumulation of perceptive, realistic and critical analyses of the Myth of the "South" from rather young white Southern men and women; since that Myth has been an important bulwark of the status quo, such dissent by such persons is yet another reflection, in an era filled with like evidence, of the disintegration of that status quo. In this essay, we wish to call attention to, and briefly examine, four examples of this now fairly considerable body of such literature.

I.

W. McKee Evans, a North Carolinian, has produced a first-rate study of the realities of the Reconstruction era in one section of his own state; this is entitled, *Ballots and Fence Rails: Reconstruction on the Lower Cape Fear* (University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill, 1969), the latter being the extreme southeast corner

where were centered rice, lumber and naval-stores production. It was, then, a section of very high slave population and a center of pro-Secessionist strength.

Evans dedicates his book to Levi Coffin (1789–1877), the white North Carolina born-and-raised Abolitionist, who was so active and effective in the underground railroad that he was widely known as its "President." Here we have, it would seem, the quite conscious continuation, by Evans, of that anti-Bourbon and profreedom strain that is so significant a feature of the (largely untaught) history of Southern white people.

Certainly, the book itself makes no mystery of its partisanship toward that facet of history. It commences with an account of the first and—in this section of North Carolina—quite radical effort at reconstruction of society. From January through June, 1865, the Military District of Wilmington, which included the Union-liberated Lower Cape Fear counties, was administered by the Abolitionist General Joseph R. Hawley (later a Governor of Connecticut). Evans says:

> Under Hawley's command, the pendulum of political change swept forward toward a Radical solution to the problem of Reconstruction. Radical military courts dispensed color-blind justice. Hawley seized large plantations and settled them with freedmen. Squatters were tolerated and even assisted by the military government. The Freedmen's Bureau was vigorously supported in its welfare and educational projects. . . . Giant demonstrations marked the beginnings of a Negro political movement on the Lower Cape Fear. A local Negro leadership began to emerge (p.248).

With, however, the killing of Lincoln and the refusal by the federal government to really sustain the elimination of the plantation economy and to end the landlessness of the Black masses, Johnsonian Reconstruction took hold. In the Lower Cape Fear region the change was dramatic: Hawley was relieved, all the local government officials and militia officers who had served under the Confederacy were restored to their positions, and the *status quo ante bellum*—minus only formal chattel slavery—was restored.

Of great importance in Evans' work is his fairly detailed presentation of the resistance this reactionary policy met from the poorer and more democratic masses in the region and, in the first place, from the Afro-American population. Thus, in August 1865, a concerted demonstration and actual attack by many Black people in Wilmington forced the resignation of the municipal government

including the entire obnoxious police force, and it took Washington's intercession to alter this. Again, in February 1866 and in June 1868, massive assaults upon prisons forced the release of many Black people held in reality (there were all sorts of trumped-up charges, of course) as political hostages. Efforts to enforce reaction's rule through the use of the KKK was effectively terminated as of the Spring of 1868 through the counter-action of patrolling groups of armed Black men. Again, it took the full weight of the U.S. government to re-establish Bourbon domination in North Carolina; even with that, significant areas and forms of resistance persisted in that state, so that as late as 1901 a Black man, George H. White, was returned to Congress from the Wilmington area.[1]

II.

A very important publishing event is the issuance by the Louisiana State University Press of William I. Hair's *Bourbonism and Agrarian Protest: Louisiana Politics, 1877–*1900 (1970). Mr. Hair, a native of Winnsboro, Louisiana, was educated at Louisiana State, taught there for some time and now is on the faculty of Florida State University. His book is perhaps as significant as the earlier one—also published by Louisiana State University Press, over thirty years ago—by Roger Shugg;[2] the latter's work closed with the end of Reconstruction, while Hair's study concentrates on the post-Reconstruction generation.

Hair is quite right when he declares in his preface that "about the period of the late 19th century, as well as the early 20th, vital questions have remained unanswered, and indeed unasked." The requirements of the Myth have dictated the impermissible questions and delineated *verboten* answers. These all revolve around the realities of socioeconomic life in the South and, especially, the actual thoughts and activities of the masses in the South. These form the concern of Hair's books; treating them with comprehension and digging deeply into sources, he has produced a consequential piece of scholarship.

Hair shows that it is with the 1876 election in Louisiana--burying Reconstruction--that the very term 'bulldozing," meaning the forcible repression of popular political will, made its original appearance. Events took place in that state at that time, associated with reaction's triumph, which--as Hair quotes a contemporary--"would have disgraced Turks in Bulgaria."

In response, ideas of migration took hold and were acted upon by tens of thousands of Black men and women; Hair describes this Exodus (especially that of 1879) at some length but not with a full

grasp of the sources and with decided unfairness to the role of Frederick Douglass. This is, therefore, the least successful chapter in the work. Historically, however, the basic response, certainly for the years until the twentieth century, was to stay, to survive, and to fight back.

That fight-back, by Black and poorer white, in the generation prior to the twentieth century, in Louisiana, is described more fully by Hair than has hitherto been done.

. . .

The great fact is that increasingly both white and Black victims appreciated a common need for solidarity; "the most explicit plea for racist justice was voiced" by a leader of "the lower class whites" (p. 192). More and more, Black and white met together, campaigned together, went on strike together and began to vote together; "such un-Southern happenings surely frightened the Bourbon Democrats" (p. 238). Hence, as the *Tensas Gazette* editorialized in 1896, "We can no longer depend upon the solidarity of the white race"; therefore what was needed was "either a limitation of the suffrage" or further resort to "strife, bloody riots, and the degradation of society." In the 1896 elections, though murders were frequent and radical Black women were "unmercifully whipped" with barbed wire, the Populist-Fusion candidate for Governor, John N. Pharr, actually won the election and was simply counted out by those in power. The 1896 legislature then passed legislation disfranchising 90 per cent of the Blacks and tens of thousands of the poorer whites. Thus, with the conquest of the South, was the Wall Street-Washington-Bourbon alliance ready for its "liberating" mission in Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines, and for the greater glories of the twentieth century, hopefully called "The American Century" by a publicist of that alliance.

With the coming of that century, Professor Hair terminates his volume. He has produced a book that illuminates central aspects of the history of the preceding generation and therefore assists his readers in comprehending the realities of the times in which we live.

III.

A subtler, more analytical and more sweeping work than that by Evans or Hair has come from Paul M. Gaston: *The New South Creed—A Study in Southern Mythmaking* (Knopf: New York, 1970). The author was born in Fairhope, Alabama, educated at the University of North Carolina and now teaches at the University of Virginia.

Gaston's book is a study of the idea of the "New South"—its origins, meanings and foundations; as does Hair's volume, it treats of the pre-twentieth century generation. He notes that the Radical, Albion W. Tourgee, had prophesied just as the Civil War ended, back in 1865, that the Confederacy's ideas would achieve a "complete conquest" in the (white) nation by the end of the 1880's. Gaston does not show how this was done—he has not written a socioeconomic-political history at all—and his practical omission of these basic dimensions is a weakness. He shows, rather, what those ideas were, how they were molded to fit new conditions, and how they emerged triumphant in a nation whose ruling class and cohorts expounded racism the better to conduct exploitation.

As monopoly's absorption of the South's wealth required stable and acquiescing economic and political conditions, so it needed a gentlemanly, "civilized," paternalistic facade or myth to rationalize the process. As Gaston points out, in this post–Civil War generation the railroads of the South came into Morgan's hands, its steel, iron and coal into Carnegie's and its mineral resources into those of the Mellons, du Ponts and Rockefellers; in direct charge were the Bourbons. To explain this lucrative arrangement—in the Union League Clubs, in the editorial pages of *The New York Times,* at Harvard and Yale convocations, before meetings of bankers—required the mellifluous phrases of a Henry Grady, a Henry Watterson, a Walter Hines Page or a Richard Edmonds, not the blatant obscenities of some dime-a-dozen demagogue.

The explanation was the myth of the "New South"; it was grounded on racism—but a paternalistically phrased one; it affirmed unbounding good will and generosity to the Black population—which it alone "understood" and therefore knew "how to handle"; and it guaranteed unrestrained profit-making opportunities among a contented and grateful working population, untarnished by notions of unions and impervious to the appeals of "agitators."

It was elitist to the core, suspicious of all education—except the training of "hands"—intensely male chauvinist, jingoist, Social Darwinist, and eager to sell the South so long as its propagators could remain as the overseers.

Gaston pays insufficient attention to the opposing views of such Southerners—white and Black—as George Washington Cable, Lewis H. Blair, J. C. Price and George H. White; he notes that Du Bois, living in the South in the 1890's , "produced an impressive literature of dissent" (p. 225), but does no more than note it.

Had Gaston paid more attention to the antagonists, he would have deepened his presentation of the New South mythologists; he also

would not have made the mistake of referring to Booker T. Washington as "the most influential champion of Negro freedom of his generation" on one page (175) and then commenting on another (209) that Washington "accepted the Social Darwinism of his age" and served as an enormous source of strength for the New South propagandists.

The main point of the New South creed is made quite clear by Gaston and it is his book's greatest strength: "nearly every New South declaration of loyalty to the Union was also an appeal for Northern capital" and "a Northern hands-off policy was insurance for the safety of Northern capital in the South" (p.95). He concludes persuasively: "The New South myth, fully articulated, offered a harmonizing and reassuring world view to conserve the essential features of the status quo" (p. 221). He sees irony, finally, in the fact that the nation as a whole now is more and more what the South was—doubtful of itself, frustrated, racist, immoral, with lost innocence, aware of poverty and beset with crisis. This is more than the working of irony in history; it is also the fact of retribution. The cancer, not having been excised, has overspread the body; only interring the corpse will make possible now truly a new nation—and a New South.

IV.

The quartet we had in mind is completed by Anne F. Scott's *The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics, 1830–1930* (University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1970). The author, a Georgian, teaches at Duke University in North Carolina. She had been working for some time on the Progressive Movement in the South but in studying this material Professor Scott became more and more persuaded that a significant story of the activities of women in that region remained largely untold. She was right, of course, and happily decided to *begin* telling that story.

In doing this, she became convinced "that southern women in the years before 1860 [and after, as her book shows] had been the subjects—perhaps the victims—of an image of women which was at odds with the reality of their lives." Her book sets for itself four tasks; in her own words:

> . . . to describe the culturally defined image of the lady; to trace the effect this definition had on women's behavior; to describe the realities of women's lives which were often at odds with the image; to describe and characterize the struggle of women to free themselves from the confines of cultural expectation and find a way to self-determination.

Within rather severe limits—to be indicated later—this work accomplishes its announced purposes; no doubt the limits are partially explicable since the attempt is a pioneering one and represents work in manuscripts hitherto largely untouched; also the book is a brief one, coming to perhaps 70,000 words.

Professor Scott demonstrates the profoundly male-supremacist character of dominant Southern society spanning the period from Andrew Jackson to Herbert Hoover and suggests, though she fails to affirm and demonstrate, its relationship to the racism poisoning the region. She does comment that "the most articulate spokesmen for slavery [among the men] were also eloquent exponents of the subordinate role of women" and she does point to the social-stabilizing effect of women's subordination in a society based upon chattel slavery, but she does not quite make the significant point that the reality of Afro-American slavery intensified the reality of oppression of all women.

The material she has studied makes her conclude that Southern white women detested the system of slavery; some remarked on the similarity of their own inferior status and the enslaved condition of Black people. Professor Scott also emphasizes that the sexual exploitation of Black women by the white male master class was especially hateful to the white women; as Mary Chestnut, of South Carolina, said, "They hate slavery worse than Mrs. Stowe does." For, as the same Mrs. Chestnut wrote, they understood that the system of slavery made the white wife the chief mistress in a house of prostitution. One might add, and Professor Scott perhaps did not know this, that the wife of the fourth President of the United States said exactly the same thing.

While Mrs. Scott takes extended note of the sexual relationship between white men and slave women, she makes no mention at all of such relationships between Black men and white women though the evidence concerning this is quite abundant, and certainly is not unrelated—among other things—to women's resentment at the male "double standard." Further, in terms of the sources of the white women's hatred of slavery, Professor Scott omits the fear of the slaves; retribution that permeated their lives. The evidence concerning this is quite good; for example, though Professor Scott quotes the journal kept by the daughter of Frances Ann Kemble, she does not cite the better-known journal of the famed actress herself. In it, Mrs. Kemble—writing from a Georgia plantation—commented, ". . . every Southern *woman* to whom I have spoken on the subject has admitted to me that they live in terror of their slaves" (italics in original). Again, Mrs. Emily P. Burke, in her *Reminiscences of*

Georgia (published in 1850), remarked that she had "known ladies that would not dare to go to sleep without one or two pistols under their pillows," and Mary Chestnut's *Diary* itself, several times referred to by Professor Scott, makes commentary upon the fear of the slaves.

In general, a serious weakness in this book is that on slavery, the Civil War and Reconstruction it never rises beyond hoary Philippsian-Dunning mythology. On the latter period, for example, Professor Scott in touching very lightly upon the KKK., cites of "such capers as the Ku Klux Klan"—a strange description indeed, of wholesale murderers and arsonists in the service of counter-revolution.

But the book does show that many Southern upper-class white women performed roles and had ideas that were decidedly in conflict with the traditional mythology. It shows further that dissenting movements in the South, such as the Grange, the Farmers' Alliance and the Populist Movement, took positions favoring equality for women. Its description of the heroic efforts of Southern white women—like Julia Tutwiler of Alabama, Rebecca Felton of Georgia, Jessie D. Ames of Texas, Bertha Newell and Clara Cox of North Carolina—to overcome male supremacy and to advance other consequential social changes, including struggles against racism, represents an important contribution to American historical writing.

The limitations of the book are great and in view of its importance all the more lamentable. They are reflected in this introductory paragraph:

> This book deals largely with women who left a mark on the historical record, which means for the most part women of educated or wealthy families. In antebellum times the wives of small farmers and the slave women lived, bore children, worked hard, and died, leaving little trace for the historian coming after. Such women were not much affected by role expectations. When they sweated in the fields or tore their hands digging in the ground no one lectured them on feminine delicacy or told them it was unladylike to work so long and hard. In more recent times, too, definitions of what was ladylike were reserved for women of the elite group, not for wives of mill workers or Negro maids.

No, this will not do. "The historical record" does not consist "for the most part" of the doings of the rich; *the record which historians in the largest majority have hitherto concerned themselves with deals with that class.* Certainly it is true that it is much easier

to find papers and diaries left by such people and that the newspapers were owned by them and treated them—alone—with respect. But if an historian brings eyes trained by knowledge of this overwhelming bias and a brain in rebellion against it, then he or she will uncover much of the reality of the drawers of water and the hewers of wood—of the real creators and producers. Some of that is in the papers and letters of the rich themselves and some of it is in the records of the ruling class; machinery of control—in their court records and prison documents and treasurers' accounts—and some of it persists in the records which were kept by the oppressed, not least those who were Black. Thus, Professor Scott cites the writings of a white and wealthy woman from Memphis, but there is the record of the remarkable Black woman out of Memphis—that one-woman crusade for justice, Mrs. Ida B. Wells-Barnett; and if one is examining the work of women's clubs, they were not all made up of white women, for there were dozens of organizations among Afro-American women.

Professor Scott has broken away—in her notable book—from the male-dominated preoccupation of American history writing and this is a splendid achievement and helps open the door to very important future work; but that writing has been dominated too by a white, Anglo-Saxon and—above all—ruling-class orientation, and breaking away from that, in writing as in living, is the basically truth-revealing stance for the historian.

Meanwhile, it is clear that younger Southern white historians are rebelling against the Bourbon-made apologia that hitherto has served in the guise of a history of their region. This is a momentous forward step in the social sciences in the United States.

NOTES

1. The Afro-American scholar, Helen Grey Edmonds, produced a splendid study of this latter period in *The Negro and Fusion Politics in North Carolina, 1895-1901,* University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1951.
2. Roger Shugg, *Origins of Class Struggle in Louisiana: A Social History of White Farmers and Laborers During Slavery and After,* Baton Rouge, 1939 (re-issued in paper in 1966). The present writer reviewed this book soon after it appeared, in *New Masses,* March 26, 1940.

PART III. RACISM AND IMPERIALISM

U.S. IMPERIALISM AND RACISM: A HISTORY[1]

Racism is a social phenomenon; hence, it has a history, that is to say a beginning, a development and, there is reason to believe, a termination.

Racism—i.e., the idea that particular people or peoples are significantly and immutably inferior to other peoples in important characteristics, especially intellectual and moral, and that these stigmata have their origins in biological roots and are therefore unfailingly transmitted from generation to generation—is, historically speaking, a modern idea. (Needless to say, perhaps, the standards by which "inferiority" and "superiority" were established were set by those who announced themselves as superior to begin with!)

Reactions of difference, of fear, of hostility in the face of strangers recur in history—as do reactions of welcome, interest and even veneration before strangers. But these, including the former, were not features of racism as above defined and as constituting the essence of what we mean by the term.

That meaning comes into the so-called Western world with the beginnings of mercantile capitalism in about the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; it is a reflection of that system's conquest of the colored peoples of the world—especially those inhabiting Africa—and of the fact that such conquest meant extraordinary cruelty, naked robbery, systematic slaughter and—above all—enslavement via a highly organized slave trade in a new world, "discovered" and conquered and occupied as part of the appearance and development of that same capitalism.

All this—certainly the most foul sustained atrocity in history—it must be emphasized is conducted by Christian societies; something of the need for special rationalization appears when one observes that the first English slave-trading vessel was named "Jesus." The particular need for rationalization for the eighteenth and nineteenth century U.S. is clear when one recalls not only its Christian roots

but also its birth-certificate which announced that "all men are created equal" and affirmed the revolutionary concept of popular sovereignty.

Noting that the Declaration of Independence means white men when it speaks of all men being created equal, calls to mind the fact that the Declaration did not mean to include women when it said men and that it actually limited even the idea of men not only to those who were colorless but also to those who were propertied—for it must be remembered that in 1776 about one-third of the white male population in the rebelling nation were indentured servants. They, with the poor in general, were not part of the term "people" in proper eighteenth-century political science.

Emphasis must be given to the fact that all class societies—which means all recorded history—manifests elitism based upon wealth and sex. Thus, the idea of the inferiority of women in general and of the propertyless masses as a whole permeates all class society, long antedating capitalism. Capitalist society welcomes and in many ways intensifies both these traditional forms of elitism; in addition, capitalism creates and sustains racism—the most foul, most poisonous form of elitism. In this sense, there was a certain intellectual preparation for racism; it took over, intensified and deepened the elitism with which the ruling class had considered women in general and poor people in particular—as being in fact inferior creatures. On the latter, note in the language the double meanings of: poor-poor; rich-rich; noble-noble. Observe also the relationship between, for example, proper-property; propriety-proprietor, etc.

At the earliest period of the enslavement of African peoples, the justification was that they were animals. In the face of the fact that white men found African women sexually desirable and the further fact that copulation between white men and African women produced infants, persistence in concepts of bestiality produced certain embarrassments for the white men. Further, it was at once discovered that while cows and horses never had to be forbidden to read or to assemble together and never mutinied and rebelled, these "non-humans" from Africa did present such necessities and such proclivities. Furthermore, if they were human, they had souls—and souls not yet saved. Surely the church had a vested interest, then, in affirming their humanity—what a treasure of millions of souls to be saved for Christ!

The latter harvest induced its own difficulties for there did exist a tradition of enslaving heathen, but for Christian to enslave Christian was something different. The delicacy was subject to flexibility, however; it was, indeed, affirmed by law in English

colonies in the seventeenth century that conversion did not mean emancipation. This, too, helped make useful the idea of racism—of the immutable and significant inferiority, of one of the Christians to the other—a condition which helped justify the enslavement of the inferior by the superior. Indeed, with the marvelous ingenuity characteristic of the human brain in search of rationalization this very asserted inferiority made it a Christian *duty* on the part of the superior Christian to hold in slavery the inferior one. Here we have a root of the "white man's burden," and the paternalism so significant an ingredient in chauvinism, i.e., one must "take care of" his slaves!

(One may note an analogous development in terms of anti-Jewish paranoia. Up to the latter part of the nineteenth century the rationalization for so-called anti-Semitism was religious—i.e., the Jews' rejection of Christianity. But with the appearance of monopoly capitalism in Europe, and the U.S., anti-Semitism became rationalized in terms approximating racism—i.e., the fact that Jews were not Anglo-Saxons or Aryans, whatever these terms meant.)

The relationship between the rise of capitalism and ravishment of Africa and the enslavement of its peoples is well established: the classical description and analysis appears in the first volume of Marx's *Capital*. Because of the special relationship of the slave trade to the development of mercantile capitalism in the U.S. and the basic significance of that trade and of slavery for the developing economy in the U.S., especially but not only in the South, there is an intense organic connection between capitalism in the U.S. and the appearance and maintenance of a racist social order.

Similarly, the relationship between monopoly capitalism, imperialism and the special exploitation of the colored peoples of the world, particularly in Africa, is well established. The Berlin conference of the 1880s, in which the major capitalist powers divided Africa among themselves, reflects this connection. Again, however, there is a special and organic connection between U.S. imperialism and the strengthening, nationalizing and further rationalizing of racism.

There is, as there should be, a library on the relationship of Middle East and Latin American oil and the development of imperialism in general, but there is not yet a book, let alone a library, on the relationship of the oil of Mississippi, Louisiana, Oklahoma and Texas and the rise of monopoly capitalism in the U.S. Fundamental to the process whereby the mercantile-industrial capitalism of the Lincoln era became the monopoly-finance capitalism of the McKinley-Roosevelt era, was the conquest of the South by northern

capitalism (and of the West and Southwest one must add—which brings in the genocidal war upon the Indian peoples and the expropriation of their resources, and the anti-Asian and anti-Mexican chauvinisms—also culminating in that same era and enhancing the racist pollution).

But at stake in the crushing of Reconstruction and later the crushing of Populism was the acquisition of the colossal resources of the South and then their retention, and there is more oil in the Southwest than in most other parts of the world, not to speak of the coal, iron, sulphur, lumber and cotton of the South. Hence to crush popular and democratic and therefore objectively anti-racist movements in the South meant the acquisition by this young industrial capitalism of a veritable empire within its own borders—an empire of colossal extent (Texas is the size of France and Germany, for instance) and of enormous wealth. And as for the labor force, there at hand were (then) nine million Black people and twelve million white people, most of them propertyless, with a heritage of intense racism on the basis of which those twenty millions could be divided, kept unorganized and subjected to the superexploitation characteristic of Venezuela or South Africa.

The process may be traced in terms of laws and institutions. It is in the 1880s that the process of legalizing and enforcing a racist society commences in the South. This process culminates in the constitutional disfranchisement of the Black people, in appropriate amendments beginning in Mississippi in 1895; South Carolina, 1895; Louisiana, 1898; North Carolina, 1901; Alabama, 1901; Virginia, 1902; Georgia, 1908; Oklahoma, 1910.

Observe also that the Supreme Court after undertaking in the 1880s the destruction of anti-racist legislation coming from Reconstruction, helps speed and consolidate the affirmative institutionalizing and legalizing of a racist society by the 1896 decision of *Plessy vs. Ferguson.* Note that this comes the year after Booker T. Washington in 1895 announced his program of acquiescence in the subordination of the Black millions in the South.

All this—the state laws, the Supreme Court's acts, the Tuskegee Machine and the general policy of mass terror and wholesale lynchings marking the years from 1885 to about 1910—are undertaken, too, in an effort to suppress very significant popular resistance by Black people and by white people, separately and together. One may simply *mention* here the great Populist movement in the South or the general strike of Black and white workers in New Orleans in 1892, or the organized militancy which produced the challenge by the Black man, Homer A. Plessy, resulting in *Plessy vs. Ferguson.*

One should note here, too, especially since the literature neglects it, that there still exists important anti-racist feeling in the nation as a whole. For example, from 1891–95 eleven northern states passed significant civil rights laws and in 1899 Utah and Montana prohibited segregated schools, while in 1892 the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church denounced racism and called for a national campaign against it.

It is to stem all this, pervert it, thwart it, in North and South, among Black and white, that one has the development of the Tuskegee Machine, the Plessy decision, and the intensification of chauvinist propaganda.

All this is going on during the period of the burgeoning of U.S. monopoly capitalism, the appearance of U.S. imperialism. This relationship is not simply temporal; it is causal.

Much has been written about the development of monopoly capitalism in this post–Civil War generation. There is a mountain of literature on the Rockefellers, Hills, Harrimans, Carnegies, Armours, Havemeyers and Morgans who make their debuts during this era, crush competition, perfect their monopolies and start—especially with the Spanish-American War of 1898–99—their careers as international tycoons.

But just as the enslavement of millions of Afro-American workers here for hundreds of years is neglected in historical literature as a key explanation for the speed and magnitude of the development of U.S. capitalism, so the conquest of the South and the forcible repression of the Afro-American people is neglected in the literature on the rise of U.S. imperialism. The fact of the matter, however, is that when monopoly capitalism in the United States turned its attention seriously to overseas investments and to the appropriation of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Cuba and the Philippines, it simultaneously turned its attention seriously to investments in the South and to the establishment of terrorist domination of the Southern masses and especially of the Black people. Just as the former activity produced the most rabid type of jingoism, so the latter, basing itself on the racism derived from slavery, produced the most virulent form of white chauvinism. Just as the former resulted in the imposition, by law, of second-class citizenship upon the peoples of the new colonies, so the latter had the same result for the masses of the so-called New South and especially for the Black people.

Contemporaries, especially among Afro-American leaders like Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois and William Monroe Trotter, pointed out the connection between U.S. aggression overseas and the mounting terror

against the Black people. Others observed this, too. Thus, Senator George F. Hoar of Massachusetts, one of the very few Republican leaders to oppose imperialism, pointed out that the ideological justification for the subjugation of the people of Cuba, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the Philippines was identical with that hitherto offered by Bourbon Democrats on the so-called Negro question. Moorfield Storey, distinguished Boston attorney and later the first president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, was a leader in the anti-imperialist movement. In 1905, while reasserting his conviction "that our Philippine policy is wrong," Storey added, "I feel that it is also responsible for the reaction at home against the Negroes."

At the same period the Bourbon Senator Tillman of South Carolina remarked: "Republican leaders do not longer dare to call into question the justice or the necessity of limiting Negro suffrage in the South." And again, on the floor of the Senate: "I want to call your attention to the remarkable change that has come over the spirit of the dream of the Republicans. Your slogans of the past—brotherhood of man and fatherhood of God—have gone glimmering down the ages. The brotherhood of man exists no longer."

It is pertinent to observe that the treaty annexing the Philippines would certainly have failed of ratification by the Senate had there not existed a coalition on this question between the Republicans and the Bourbon Democrats.

By the late 1880s there was in full swing in the South what its people called "The Great Barbecue," by which they meant the conquest of their land by northern capital. In 1880 the South produced 400,000 tons of pig iron; by 1890 this was quadrupled. In the same decade the quantity of timber taken from southern forests more than doubled and there ensued an enormous expansion in the furniture industry. From 1880 to 1900 the number of textile mills in the South increased three and a half times, the number of spindles over seven times, and by 1915 there were more cotton textile mills in the South than in the rest of the country. Bituminous coal production in the South leaped from six million tons in 1880 to 52 million tons in 1900. Other industries, like tobacco and railroads, grew correspondingly.

Consolidation came with growth, a fact which may be indicated by mentioning the appearance in the 1890s of such giant corporations as the American Tobacco Company and the Tennessee Coal, Iron and Railroad Company. While some of the early capital for this expansion was local, as the movement continued a greater and

greater proportion of the capital investments came from northern monopolies. Thus, by 1900, while half a billion dollars were invested abroad, one billion dollars had been invested in southern manufacturing. By 1900 J. P. Morgan & Co. controlled the Baltimore & Ohio, the Southern and the Central of Georgia, and by 1907 the recently formed United States Steel Corporation (also dominated by Morgan) had absorbed Carnegie Steel and the tremendous properties of the Tennessee Coal, Iron and Railroad trust centered in the Birmingham-Chattanooga area.

Monopoly capitalism has fastened itself nowhere and upon no people without a struggle. This is as true of the southern people in general and the Black people in particular as of any other people in the world. I have documented this resistance elsewhere in print and space does not permit expansion at this point.

To smash this resistance, to resubject the Afro-American people to special oppression and fully to conquer the South, U.S. imperialism turned to the weapons of fraud, terror and white chauvinism. When these three instruments succeeded in smashing opposition, it was that same imperialism which saw to it that the laws codifying and sustaining white chauvinism, to which reference has already been made, were passed.

The brutality of this imperialism was complete everywhere. It was H. O. Havemeyer, of the Sugar Trust, who told the Federal Industrial Commission in 1899: "I do not care two cents for your ethics. I don't know enough of them to apply them. . . . As a business proposition, it is right to get all out of a business that you possibly can."

It was a leading Republican newspaper, the San Francisco *Argonaut,* which said in January 1899:

> The Anglo-Saxon methods of warfare do not appeal to the Malay (i.e., the Filipino). In pursuance of our imperialistic plans, it would be well to hire some of the insurgent lieutenants to betray Aguinaldo and other chieftains into our clutches. A little bribery, a little treachery and a little ambuscading, and we could trap Aguinaldo and his chieftains. Then, instead of putting them to death in the ordinary way, it might be well to torture them. The Spaniards have left behind them some means to that end in the dungeons in Manila. The rack, the thumbscrew, the trial by fire, the trial by molten lead, boiling insurgents alive, crushing their bones in ingenious mechanisms of torture—these are some of the methods that would impress

> the Malay mind. It would show them that we are in earnest. . . . This may seem to some of the more sentimental of our readers like grim jesting. It is not. It is grim earnest.

In June 1894, the *Nation* reported the Right Reverend Hugh Miller Thompson, Bishop of Mississippi, justifying lynching because "the laws are slow and the jails are full." In November 1898, Colonel A. M. Waddell said in North Carolina, according to the Raleigh *News and Observer,* that "we are resolved" to win the elections in Wilmington "if we have to choke the current of Cape Fear with carcasses. The time for smooth words has gone by, the extremist limit of forbearance has been reached." Five days later the colonel led an armed force against the Black-white administration of Wilmington, slaughtered scores, and announced himself the new mayor, and the federal government gave silent assent.

In 1900 the San Francisco *Argonaut* said: "We do not want the Filipinos. We want the Philippines. The islands are enormously rich, but, unfortunately, they are infested by Filipinos. There are many millions there, and it is to be feared their extinction will be slow." That same year Senator Tillman of South Carolina announced on the floor of the United States Senate: "We took the government away. We stuffed the ballot boxes. We shot Negroes! We are not ashamed of it."

And respectable Republican papers of the North—the organs of monopoly capitalism, of that which had usurped the South and that for which the Tillmans worked—nodded approval. Thus, in 1898, the *Philadelphia Record* said: "We have evidently just begun the task of Americanizing the African," and the Providence, Rhode Island *Journal* editorialized that same year that perhaps the Black person "could be made a more orderly citizen if there were restored something like the old interest taken by the masters and mistresses in the Negro boys and girls around them."

The Black "boys" and "girls" were made "orderly citizens" and "Americanized" in the inimitable manner of U.S. imperialism. That is, from 1889 through 1901 there were 1,955 recorded lynchings or an average of 165 lynchings per year for 12 years. Thus, in these dozen years of the rise of U.S. imperialism there occurred 42 per cent of all recorded lynchings from 1882 through 1947.

To back up the fraud, terror and laws went the evolving of a modern "scientific" white chauvinism. The writings of Herbert Spencer in sociology, Madison Grant in anthropology, William A. Dunning in history, William McDougall and the whole paraphernalia and corruption of so-called intelligence tests in psychology, the

distortions of Darwinism, bolstered this chauvinism.

To give an idea of what this meant I shall quote simply the work of an anatomist, R. B. Bean of Johns Hopkins University. In 1906, Bean published in the very widely circulated popular magazine, *Century,* a study of "The Negro Brain." Here were his conclusions—and they were broadcast by the general press: "The Caucasian and the Negro are fundamentally opposite extremes in evolution . . . it is useless to try to elevate the Negro by education or otherwise, except in the direction of his natural endowments. . . . Let them win their reward by diligent service." When three years later, Franklin P. Mall, Professor of Anatomy at Johns Hopkins and founder of the *American Journal of Anatomy,* proved Bean's work to be fraudulent and his conclusions nonsensical, his—Mall's—report appeared only in the *American Journal of Anatomy.* It did not reach the audience which had been exposed to Bean's vicious lies.

Even the organized labor movement showed the effect of rising chauvinism. Thus, the AFL, which had had a rather good record on Black-white unity in the late '80s and in the early '90s, began to adopt itself more and more to a Jim Crow pattern by the end of the century. By the early 1900s its craft base and general opportunism were nowhere reflected more tellingly than in its crass white supremacist practices.

This is the period of the proliferation on a mass level of such garbage as the Rev. Charles Carroll's *The Mystery Solved: The Negro a Beast* (1900) and his *The Tempter of Eve* (1902); of Thomas Dixon's *The Leopard's Spots: A Romance of the White Man's Burden* (1902) and his *The Clansman: An Historical Romance of the Ku Klux Klan (1905)*—the basis for the first mass-displayed motion picture, *Birth of a Nation* (1915).

It is the time when magazines like *Colliers, Saturday Evening Post, North American Review, Century,* etc., published the most blatantly racist stories and essays.

As George H. White of North Carolina—the last southern Black member of Congress until 1972—said in his farewell address on January 29, 1901 in the House, "Possibly at no time in the history of our freedom has the effort been made to mold public opinion against us and our progress so strongly as it is now being done."

Here are a few examples of the kind of crass racism appearing in this period from most distinguished sources.

Edward A. Freeman, perhaps the most honored historian writing in English in the late nineteenth century, visited Herbert Baxter Adams of Johns Hopkins University and leading founder of the American Historical Association. Recalling his impressions of the United States for an English publication—the *Fortnightly Review,*

September 1882—Mr. Freeman remarked that the social problems besetting that country arose from its racially mixed population; he thought they could all be solved if only "every Irishman were to kill a Negro and be hanged for it."

John W. Burgess, then Dean of the Faculty of Political Science at Columbia University, was writing in his two-volume opus, *Political Science and Comparative Constitutional Law* (1890–91) that if what he called barbaric peoples resisted "the exercise of force in imposing organization . . . the civilized state may clear the territory of their presence" and in the magazine published by Columbia University, the *Political Science Quarterly,* in September 1895, this Dean urged a halt to immigration because: "We must preserve our Aryan nationality in the state, and admit to its membership only such non-Aryan race-elements as shall have become Aryanized in spirit and in genius by contact with it."

In 1903 the *American Sociological Review* was publishing statements such as, "slavery was the most humane and the most practical method ever devised for 'bearing the white man's burden.' " And five years later, in 1908, the same *American Sociological Review* was publishing this: "It is only through the recognition that the average Negro is still a savage child of nature that the North and the South can be brought to unite in work to uplift the race."

These being the published views of such people and such organs one may, perhaps, understand what Du Bois faced and one will begin to have some comprehension of what he accomplished. One can better, for example, understand the significance of a book such as his *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903); the very tioe of that book—affirming that Black folks have souls—will carry greater meaning to the person who understands the context and the society within which it was produced. One may also be able better to compare the scientific status of one like Du Bois and one like Columbia's Dean and the editors of the *American Sociological Review.*

Naturally, then, the textbooks which educated the youth of the land reflected this "scholarship." Thus, the *Morse Speller,* by S. T. Dutton, published in New York City in 1896, stated: "To the Caucasian race by reason of its physical and mental superiority, has been assigned the task of civilizing and enlightening the world;" and *A System of Modern Geography,* by S. A. Mitchell, published in Philadelphia in 1892, affirmed that white people were "superior to all others in intellectual and moral development, and are the leaders of Christian civilization," while the *Natural Advanced Geography* by John Redway, published in New York in 1898 by the American Book Company, assured its readers that the African peoples were

"the least civilized of all races."[2]

This is the moment of the appearance of Kipling's poem, "The White Man's Burden" (1899) which was more widely reprinted and recited in the United States than in Great Britain; here is its key stanza:

> Take up the White Man's Burden
> Send forth the best ye breed—
> Go, bind your sons to exile
> To serve your captives' need;
> To wait, in heavy harness,
> On fluttered folk and wild—
> Your new-caught sullen peoples,
> Half devil and half child

One sees the motif of unselfishness, as repeated by that latter-day Disraeli, Richard Nixon, affirming the unspeakable assault by U.S. imperialism upon the peoples of Indochina as a magnificent exercise in compassion and philanthropy!

In the United States, the historical evidence demonstrates that imperialism, basing itself upon the white supremacy of slavery, developed and nurtured white chauvinism as its ideological reflection and bulwark. Hence, to struggle against racism is to struggle against imperialism. If that struggle is lost, a fascist United States will appear. A fascist Germany meant disaster for humanity; a fascist United States will mean ultimate catastrophe for humanity. Nothing less than this is at stake in the effort to extirpate racism.

NOTES

1. This paper was the keynote address at a Symposium on Racism held at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst, April 1973.
2. These, and many other examples, will be found in the very useful work by Ruth M. Elson, *Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the Nineteenth Century*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, 1967.

STERILIZATION AND IMPERIALISM

Ideologists serving exploitative systems always have insisted that the extant order was not only sensible and proper but also inevitable. Hence, slavery reflected the nature of the slaves; its existence, therefore, was not only logical but also beneficial—to the slaves, of course—else "who will take care of them?" Colonialism existed because of the nature of those colonized; hence, again it was both logical and philanthropic, as it were—i.e., "the white man's burden." Racist segregation exists because of the nature of those segregated and again is both logical and humane. Slums exist because of the nature of the slum dwellers; the impoverished are in that condition because of their nature; class positions reflect the realities of the respective capacities of the classes, with those on the bottom being there because in merit and intelligence—in capacity—they are in fact at the bottom.[1] Of course, all standards are assumed to be those of the exploiters and rulers and all "tests" are created by them, based upon their values and assumptions, administered by them, and evaluated by them. Naturally.

Ruling-class rationalizers have never lacked ingenuity. If Black slaves in the United States were prone to flee from their owners—despite the latter's well-known benevolence and the former's colossal contentment—this is due to the "fact" that they—like cats—were subject to a particular disease, drapetomania, which induces its victims to suddenly "scat." And medical texts some one hundred and thirty years ago described this disease and suggested remedies—as strange as the affliction—such as removing toe nails or placing bits in the mouth of the patient.

If slaves rebel, or workers organize, "outside agitators" are at fault. If rebellions rock ghettos or jails, it is because aggressive instincts have manifested themselves; these, too, explain the wars that incessantly have marked human history. Indeed, social ills in general reflect the rottenness of people in general, the devil in all of us, humanity's incorrigible foulness—whether in theological or in secular language, one thing is clear and that is that the fault does not lie in those who rule and possess and control and luxuriate.

Perish that thought—and let perish those who think it!

A potent variant of this ruling-class practice of blaming the victim[2] was to ascribe impoverishment to a superfluity of population—an idea first systematically presented by the Reverend Thomas Malthus at the close of the eighteenth century when ruling classes from Europe to the islands of the New World were being challenged by mass upheavals and by democratic and egalitarian concepts held to be "self-evident truths." In neo-Malthusian terms, these false and anti-human ideas have been refurbished until one finds seriously expressed the idea that "people, in themselves, constitute a pollution."[3]

The political form reflecting the institutionalizing of imperialism's anti-humanism is fascism; its main propaganda device is racism. The ultimate logic of this is crematoria; people themselves constituting the pollution and inferior people in particular, then crematoria become really vast sewerage projects. Only so may one understand those who attended the ovens and concocted and conducted the entire enterprise; those "wasted"—to use U.S. army jargon reserved for colonial hostilities—are not really, not fully, people.

Two dramatic developments recently exposed in the United States are significant signs of fascistic tendencies among important components of the ruling class. We mean here to note these developments, comment upon their backgrounds and suggest something of their meanings for our time and nation.

In July 1973, Mr. and Mrs. Lonnie Relf, of Montgomery, Alabama, complained to the Southern Poverty Law Center, located in that city, that two of their daughters—Mary Alice, twelve years old, and Minnie Lee, fourteen years old—had been surgically sterilized without their knowledge or consent. Ensuing investigation uncovered the fact that another daughter of the Relfs—who lived on relief payments totaling $156 per month for all five people—named Katie, aged seventeen, had escaped such surgery only because she had physically resisted. Several months prior to the operations, it was also discovered, these three children had been injected regularly with an experimental drug called *Depo-provera*, supposed to prevent conception; this had been stopped in the Spring of 1973 upon orders from Washington authorities when it was found that these tests upon laboratory animals linked it with the onset of cancer. The drug no longer being available, the Montgomery authorities had then operated upon the youngsters.

Shortly after news of the Relf case broke, other cases came to light, as that of Mrs. Marietta Williams, also a Black woman, of

Aiken, South Carolina, and also on relief. About to have her third child, the white doctor—one Clovis H. Pierce—refused to serve her unless she consented to being sterilized. Dr. Pierce, when interviewed, stated that his policy was to require sterilization after a woman on welfare had had three children; he was doing this, he said, to reduce welfare costs upon tax-paying citizens. It was then discovered that Aiken County hospital records showed that of 34 deliveries paid for by Medicaid in 1972, eighteen included sterilization and that all eighteen were Black women, and that all were performed by this same crusading Dr. Pierce who, in the preceding eighteen months, had been paid by that hospital fees totaling $60,000 of tax-payers' money![4]

After the Williams case became known, Mrs. Carol Brown, a white woman and mother of four children—also on relief, in Aiken—revealed that Dr. Pierce had refused to serve her as the birth of a fifth child approached unless she agreed either to sterilization or to paying his normal $250 fee. Her child was delivered for her by a physician in Georgia. This case—involving a white person—received especially considerable publicity; it soon became clear, as Anne Braden has written in the cited article "that what had come to light so far was only a small tip of a large iceberg."

It was soon discovered that within the past year in Montgomery the Relf children were not alone in their maltreatment; on the contrary eleven girls—all about the ages of the Relf youngsters—had been sterilized and that ten of them were Black. Then it was announced that from around April 1972 to July 1973 other government-sponsored birth control clinics—there are 3,260 in all—had sterilized at least eighty additional children; the racial and regional breakdown was not published but with past experience as a guide there is no doubt that the vast majority of the victims were Black and southern.

By mid-July 1973 an investigation was under way in the Senate under the direction of Edward M. Kennedy; it was then announced by officials of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) that in 1972 alone at least 16,000 women and 8,000 men were sterilized by the federal government and that 365 of these were below the age of 21.[5] Other realities then came to light; for example, Mrs. Nila Ruth Cox of North Carolina filed a suit in July 1973 for damages against a doctor who had sterilized her surgically back in 1966 and had then told her that this "would wear off" and that it was a "temporary five-year operation."

With the original disclosures there was briefly some significant response, such as the Kennedy hearings and the publicity these

gained. In addition one had within the South such examples as the statement issued by the Black and white Women's Coalition of Jackson, Mississippi, published in the press of that city:

> Beyond the fact of forever ending the possibility of these two young [Relf] girls having their own children is the issue of every woman's right to protection under the law to control her own body. In addition, we feel that it is clear that the girls were sterilized not for their own good but for the convenience of the social welfare system.

Other comments went even deeper; thus, Bruce Hilton, director of the national center for Bio-Ethics, located in Ridgefield, New Jersey, said: "We must face the fact there are many whites who, consciously or not, see birth control as a way to save the white race from being overwhelmed." And Eva Clayton, a veteran battler against racism from eastern North Carolina, put it even more plainly: "Whether by accident or design, family planning as it is now conceived is directed mainly toward reducing population growth among the poor, and primarily the Black poor. The implication in this direction is genocide."[6]

The furor raised in the summer due to the exposures detailed in earlier paragraphs resulted in regulations being adopted, in September, by HEW to prevent forced sterilization. Nevertheless, at the end of October 1973, the Health Research Group in Washington, D.C., released a study made by Dr. Bernard Rosenfeld, resident in obstetrics and gynecology at Los Angeles County Hospital and Sidney M. Wolfe, M.D., which stated:

> Doctors in some cities are cavalierly subjecting women, most of them poor and Black, to surgical sterilization without explaining either potential hazards or alternate methods of birth control.

Furthermore:[7]

> Many women were being subjected to sterilization methods that posed a higher degree of medical risks than other method in use.
>
> "Informed consent" forms demanded of women by some hospitals were a farce in many cases.
>
> Doctors in some hospitals were "selling" irreversible sterilization operations to many who had few children and who were under psychological stress and might not be making rational decisions.

Meanwhile, fourteen states are in the process of considering proposed legislation that *would require women on welfare to submit to*

sterilization; some time ago, Black and white women in Tennessee joined in a successful struggle against the passage of such a law in that state. Ideological justification and preparation for this kind of legislation has been appearing. Thus, Edgar R. Chasteen has devoted a book recently to arguing *The Case for Compulsory Birth Control* (Prentice-Hall, 1971) and Garrett Hardin, a well-known biologist, whose views are Social-Darwinist, argues that if a state supports children, it should have the power to legally divest potential parents of such children of the capacity to reproduce—this in his *Exploring New Ethics for Survival,* published by Viking in 1972 and by Penguin, in paper, in 1973.[8]

Some awareness of the historical dimension is needed if one is to comprehend the implications of this sterilization revival in the United States. With the beginnings of significant industrial capitalism in Europe and then in the United States, academicians turned their attention to certain threatening mass phenomena—like poverty and so-called criminal activity against property engaged in by the impoverished. Thus something called criminal anthropology appears by the late 1850s in France (B.A. Morel) and by the 1870s into the 1890s in Italy, England and the United States associated with some of the publications of Cesare Lombroso, Havelock Ellis and Richard Dugdale. At about the same time, not only was criminality biologically explained but there appeared the idea that poverty was a reflection of the biological inadequacy of the poor. There developed concepts of the "worthy poor" and the "unworthy poor" and frequently an equating of the "poorer classes" and the "criminal classes." From this it was not a very long step to the view of Marxism and socialism as the ideology of those who "threatened civilization." Hence, the concept of the "criminality" of Marxism, institutionalized in the legislation of Bismarck, the "criminal syndicalism" laws of the United States and its Smith and McCarran Acts and the practices of distinguished statesmen, such as Mussolini, Hitler, Franco and other Excellencies in South Africa, South Vietnam, South Korea, Guatemala, Greece, Iran, Brazil, Paraguay, Chile and other bulwarks of the "Free World."

With imperialism, this elitism and racism became blatant and pervasive.[9] A mixture of Social Darwinism and eugenicism became prominent, as in Henry Martyn Boies'[10] *Prisoners and Paupers* (1893) where the suggestion was made that both the impoverished and the imprisoned should be not only segregated but also castrated. W. Duncan McKim's *Heredity and Human Progress* (1900), on the basis of similar reasoning, concluded *that instead of segregation and castration,* "a gentle painless death" for the "unfit" would be a

"solution." As for castration, magazines as important as *The Outlook*—Theodore Roosevelt's favorite periodical—were advocating this for "criminal Negroes" in the early twentieth century (as President Nixon's spiritual adviser, the Reverend Billy Graham, did quite recently while visiting—of all places!—South Africa). Scientists—save the word!—also advocated this in "scientific" journals—thus Jesse Ewell, M.D., in the *Virginia Medical Semi-Monthly*, January 11, 1907: "Castrate the criminal, cut off both his ears close to his head and turn him loose to go where he will."[11] (Of course, from 1890 to 1910, others were putting "unfit" and "uncooperative" Black people to death through lynching—not exactly "painless"; castration for the male victims was a normal part of this ritual as conducted by the members of the "superior" race.)

The two most distinguished academic sociologists in the United States at this time—Professor William Z. Ripley of M.I.T. and Professor Franklin H. Giddings of Columbia University—were promulgating deeply racist views and favoring racist programs in such books as *The Races of Europe* (1899) and *Democracy and Empire* (1900)[12] while the first immigration proposals openly racist in inspiration and content were being introduced into Congress in 1895 by no less a personage than Senator Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachussetts.

It is in this general period that people of lesser academic distinction began to put into operation the logic of such ideas and books. Thus, in the 1890s a supervisor of state institutions in Indiana began castration and sterilization operations though no statutory authorization existed. After a few years word of this got out; the operations ceased, the official was neither punished nor removed but rather gently chided for his zealousness—to use a Nixonism.

The first act providing for the enforced sterilization of certain alleged defectives and "unfit" people was passed by Pennsylvania in 1905 but it was vetoed, with a notable message, by Governor Samuel W. Pennypacker. The Governor warned that the act "would be the beginning of experimentation upon living human beings, leading logically to results which can be readily forecast." Governor Pennypacker went on to cite some views from recent partisans of such legislation to the effect that ancient practices of eliminating the unfit demonstrated really extraordinary "wisdom." The first law passed in the United States for the sterilization of the "unfit" on the basis of allegedly eugenic principles came from Indiana in 1907. Two years later, that state was joined by California, Connecticut and Washington; the Connecticut law specifically included among those to be sterilized people showing an "inherited tendency to crime"!

From this period until the early 1920s twenty-one states—including almost all in the South—passed sterilization legislation. Another wave of such legislation occurred from 1927 through 1932, when Mississippi, West Virginia, Arizona, Oklahoma and Vermont passed similar laws. By the end of 1931 there had been recorded over 12,000 sterilization operations performed in accordance with the laws, while by the end of 1958 the total had climbed to over 61,000. California has the "honor" of leading all other states in the total of such operations, but three southern states—North Carolina, Georgia and Virginia—led all others in terms of operations per inhabitant.[13]

As of 1948 there were twenty-seven states which still had such sterilization laws; all included "feeblemindedness" as cause, while nine also included a category defined as "habitual criminals"; seven had a category labeled "moral degenerates" and "sexual perverts"; two included those suffering from syphilis; and one specified people suffering from "inheritable physical defects." "Feeblemindedness" was defined as scoring 70 or below on an I.Q. test. All data for all periods and all areas show that the greatest proportion of those sterilized were women and that a much higher percentage were Black rather than white people.

In the past, the presence of what one judge called "Negro blood" helped ensure sterilization of a man; in another the feebleminded-ness of a white woman was confirmed because "this patient did not possess the normal aversions of a white girl to a colored man who was perhaps nice to her." Governor Pennypacker of Pennsylvania has not been alone among officials calling attention to the dangers involved in this kind of legislation. Thus, a New Jersey court ruled in 1913 against the constitutionality of relevant state law by declaring that the logic of Malthusianism was the destruction of unwanted people and that, in addition: "Racial differences, for instance, might afford a basis for such an opinion in communities where that question is unfortunately a permanent and paramount issue." Again, in 1921, Governor William Sproul of Pennsylvania vetoed another effort by its legislature to enact sterilization requirements for "undesirable" people and remarked: "Besides those afflicted with physical or mental diseases, many other persons might be undesirable citizens in the opinion of a majority of the Legislature."[14]

The funding for the first major "scientific" institution devoted to sterilization in the name of eugenics came from Mrs. E.H. Harriman, the widow of the railroad tycoon, who explained her interest in the subject by remarking that she was an enthusiastic horsewoman and so naturally was concerned about "bloodlines." This

was the Cold Spring Harbor, New York, Eugenics Office, opened in 1910 and then in 1918 taken over as one of the enterprises of the Carnegie Institution in Washington.

Dr. Harry H. Laughlin was the man in charge of the Cold Spring Harbor effort; he served also as what was called the Eugenics Associate of the Psychopathic Laboratory of the Municipal Court of Chicago—whose chief justice, Harry Olson, was a fanatical racist and supporter of Lothrop Stoddard, the latter a Harvard Ph.D. and author of the notorious and very influential *The Rising Tide of Color*.

It was Laughlin's book, cited earlier, which was published by the Municipal Court itself and which served as a text for the eugenics movement between the two World Wars and as a source for much of the legislation in this field passed during that era.

It is in this book that one finds what is called a model eugenical state law. It is lengthy but requires quotation for it was decisive to the history and thinking in this field in the United States and in Europe—especially Germany—and it defines certain basic assumptions which still underlay elitist and racist thinking whether articulated by Schockley, Eysenck, Jensen or Banfield. The model commences with an overall target: "A socially inadequate person is one who by his or her own effort, regardless of etiology or prognosis, fails chronically in comparison with normal persons, to maintain himself or herself as a useful member of the organized social life of the state."

It then details the particulars of the target:

> The socially inadequate classes, regardless of etiology or prognosis, are the following: 1) feeble-minded; 2) insane; 3) criminalistic (including the delinquent and wayward); 4) epileptic; 5) inebriate . . .; 6) diseased (including the tuberculous, the syphilitic, the leprous, and others with chronic, infectious and legally segregable diseases); 7) blind (including those with seriously impaired vision); 8) deaf (including those with seriously impaired hearing); 9) deformed (including the crippled); and 10) dependent (including orphans, ne'er-do-wells, the homeless, tramps and paupers).

Dr. Laughlin's list of the socially inadequate who should be sterilized included people like John Milton, Beethoven, Robert Louis Stevenson, Helen Keller, Thomas Edison, O'Henry, Toulouse-Lautrec and Jesus Christ; one would think that was sufficient. But one would be wrong, for the law must encompass not only the "socially inadequate" but also "a potential parent of socially inadequate off-spring"

and obviously in a scientific work all terms must be defined; therefore Dr. Laughlin does not fail to define the potential parent of a socially inadequate offspring. Here is his definition, as stated in his model law, as to who was to be sterilized if the problems of the world were to be solved. Take a deep breath—or adjust your glasses and read on:[15]

> A potential parent of socially inadequate offspring is a person who regardless of his or her own physical, physiological or psychological personality, and of the nature of the germ-plasm of such person's co-parent, is a potential parent of at least one-fourth of whose possible offspring, because of the certain inheritance from said parent of one or more inferior or degenerate physical, physiological or psychological qualities would, on the average, according to the demonstrated laws of heredity, most probably function as socially inadequate persons; or at least one-half of whose possible offspring would receive from said parent, and would carry in the germ-plasm but would not necessarily show in the personality, the genes or genes-complex for one or more inferior or degenerate physical, physiological or psychological qualities, the appearance of which quality or qualities in the personality would cause the possessor thereof to function as a socially inadequate person under the normal environment of the state.

One could laugh, if he did not discern behind the verbal monstrosity the stench of the crematoria.

It is sobering to recall that the only ruling on the constitutionality of laws inspired by this kind of thinking that has yet come from the United States Supreme Court was pronounced by no less a person than Oliver Wendell Holmes. Holding Virginia's law to be constitutional, Justice Holmes said *(Buck v. Bell,* 1927) that "It is better for all the world if instead of waiting for their imbecility society can prevent those who are manifestly unfit from continuing their kind."

Professor J.H. Landman correctly pointed out that this decision "definitely committed the United States to a policy of human sterilization for good or for bad as a means of coping with the socially undesirable in our midst"; the decision was followed by a flood of similar legislation in other states, avowedly aimed, as Professor Landman wrote at the time, against "the acute current crime wave"—and that was published over forty years ago.

Of course, as the late J. B. S. Haldane remarked, the problem with Justice Holmes' decision—who may have known something

about the law but was not known to be an expert in biology or sociology—was that both the law and his decision left somewhat vague the "manifestly unfit" (unless one went back to Laughlin) and also the question of who continued what kind. Professor Landman cogently noted of Holmes' finding: "The opinion is astoundingly brief and unusually platitudinous. The jurist is disconcerted by the absence of citations to support its legal principles and the psychiatrist and sociologist are equally surprised by the lack of a thorough understanding of the field of eugenics."[16]

With the flood of legislation after Holmes' decision came also a new boldness in expression. Thus, Dr. Paul Popenoe, in the *Journal of Heredity* in 1928, suggested that ten million people in the United States should be sterilized, while a best-selling writer of the time Professor Walter B. Pitkin, in his *Twilight of the American Mind* (New York, 1928, Simon & Schuster) urged in his preface: "Exterminate the feebleminded and the morons! Multiply the superior stocks!"[17]

Shortly, Hitler enacted what was called the Hereditary Health Law (July 13, 1933); during its first year of operation, over 56,000 people were sterilized. Ultimately, under Hitler, about 250,000 people were so treated; this was explicitly the inspiration for so-called euthanasia under Hitler (by decree in 1939 and by law in 1941), pursuant to which 50,000 people were put to death—all this useful experimentation, of course, for the eventual mass murder of millions of "socially inadequate" people—Jews, Communists, socialists and other chronic malcontents and aliens. Books were published in the United States, after Hitler's "experimentations" had begun, which openly defended his policies and did so in terms of laws, ideas and practices which had been common in the United States.[18]

The United States, being the main spawning ground in the world for racism, with its dominant ideology immersed in elitism, with the historical background briefly sketched and with the current practices to which attention has been called, is now a society whose ruling class is in profound crisis and whose more astute political servants—like Senator Fulbright—describe it as being "sick."

It is within that context also that the proliferation of chemical and surgical experimentation upon human beings in the United States is to be weighed. Data concerning this phenomenon are accumulating. As in the case of sterilization practices, so, too, in the field of human experimentation, national attention was focused upon it because of what had been done to Black people alone, for as U.S. history in particular proves, the special victimization of one people threatens the well-being of all people. (Editors' note: for

further discussion of such experimentation see the author's article "Racism and Human Experimentation" in *Political Affairs*, February, 1974, pp. 46–59.)

Addendum

The Associated Press reported on October 25, 1986, that the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Energy Conservation and Power released a study entitled American Nuclear Guinea Pigs: Three Decades of Radiation Experiments on U.S. Citizens. In making public the study, the Subcommittee's chairperson, Rep. Edward Markey (D., Mass.), stated that the data shock the conscience. He permitted himself to ask whether American scientists mimicked the kind of demented human experiments conducted by the Nazis.

The report stated that some of those tested were willing subjects but that there is no record of informed consent for others. Apparently the experimentation included routine discharges of radioactive iodine wastes from the government-owned Hanford reservation in eastern Washington state. Resulting environmental contamination was thousands of times worse than in the Three Mile Island accident in Pennsylvania in 1979 and probably approximated that from the Chernobyl disaster in the Soviet Union in 1986.

Experiments on groups of selected human beings—where informed consent seems often to have been missing—began in 1945 and continued to at least 1971. These were conducted in scientific laboratories (as Los Alamos in the 1960s), at hospitals (as at Massachusetts General in the 1950s and at Montefiore Hospital in New York also in the 1950s) and at prisons (as in Oregon and Washington State from 1963 to 1971).

(Quotations are from *San Francisco Chronicle*, October 25, 1986, p. 2.)

NOTES

1. The entire body of ruling-class literature documents this paragraph; but on the last two positions in particular, see the work of Edward C. Banfield and of H.J. Eysenck. Mr. Banfield, late of Harvard and Chairman of Nixon's Commission on Model Cities, is now at the University of Pennsylvania; Mr. Eysenck is founder and director of the Institute of Psychiatry at the

University of London. On Banfield see this writer's critique in *Political Affairs*, December, 1970; a typical expression of Eysenck's views is "IQ, Social Class and Educational Policy," in *Change*, September 1973.

2. A good examination of this tactic in the United States today is offered in William Ryan's *Blaming the Victim* (New York, 1971, Pantheon); see the examination of that book by the present writer in *Political Affairs*, April 1971.
3. These words are from the blurb on the jacket of Richard Falk's *This Endangered Planet* (New York, 1971, Random House); the book is not nearly as bad as that blurb might indicate.
4. For the details of the Relf family case see *Poverty Law Report*, published by the Southern Poverty Law Center, in Montgomery, Alabama, for September 1973 (Vol. I, No. 3). J. Sam Nesbit, administrator of the Aiken County hospital, approved the reasoning and the practice of Dr. Pierce. See Nancy Hicks, report from Aiken in *N.Y. Times*, August 1, 1973. For details concerning similar cases elsewhere in the South, see the essay by Anne Braden in *Southern Patriot*, September 1973.
5. See, especially, the coverage of the Kennedy hearings by Jack Waugh in the *Christian Science Monitor*, July 13, 1973.
6. These quotations are given in the essays by Nancy Hicks and Anne Braden, cited earlier. Du Bois was a very early supporter of the birth-control efforts of Margaret Sanger. At the same time, fifty years ago, he warned of the racist perversions that might afflict such a movement—see H. Aptheker, ed., *The Correspondence of W. E. B. Du Bois, Vol. I, 1877–1934* (University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst, 1973, pp. 301–02). When Eva Clayton used the term "genocide" she was speaking accurately. Of the five acts specified as constituting genocide in the UN convention on its prevention (adopted December 9, 1948), the fourth reads: "Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group."
7. Richard D. Lyons, dispatch from Washington, in *New York Times*, October 31, 1973, p.7. Of a dozen surgical operations performed in a Baltimore hospital, seven of the women were under twenty years of age. This report declared that one million women and one million men "were undergoing surgical sterilization every year in the United States."
8. As part of the Cold-War and McCarthy era, with its Neo-Conservatism, went a revival of Malthusianism. Dean Acheson

thought population growth was important in explaining the Chinese Revolution, the Rockefellers began to pay for "population studies." Pressure was applied to tie "foreign aid" especially in Asia to policies of more or less compulsory sterilization; as late as 1968 Paul Ehrlich in his *The Population Bomb* was urging this. See D. Fleming, "Roots of the New Conservation Movement," in *Perspectives in American History* (Harvard University Press, 1972, VI, pp. 7–94); see also Steve Weissman, "The Population Bomb" in *American Report,* October 15, 1973.The ideas and policies were part of the counter-revolutionary essence of U.S. foreign policy.

9. The present writer first documented this relationship in an essay published in *Jewish Life* in July 1950; in more developed form, most recently in a paper delivered at a University Conference Against Racism, held in Amherst, Massachusetts, in April 1973 and published in *Political Affairs,* July 1973. Material offered in the text above is not in these already published sources.
10. Boies was a millionaire Pennsylvania industrialist, affiliated with Du Pont and prominent in antilabor activities in Pennsylvania. He was a colonel in the National Guard.
11. On the "contributions" of Boies, McKim and Ewell, see Frank W. Haller, *Eugenics: Hereditarian Attitudes in American Thought* (New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1963, Rutgers University Press, pp. 42, 46, 209).
12. Almost as distinguished as Ripley and Giddings in sociology was Edward A. Ross, a professor at the University of Wisconsin. His *The Old World in the New* (1912) was fiercely racist and deeply anti-Jewish.
13. For data and quotations prior to 1922, see Harry H. Laughlin, *Eugenical Sterilization in the United States* (published by the Psychopathic Laboratory of the Municipal Court of Chicago, 1922); for the later period, M.W. Haller, *op. cit.* and also, Moya Woodside, *Sterilization in North Carolina* (University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1950).
14. This case occurred in New Jersey in 1912—see Laughlin, *op. cit.,* p. 296. For the court's decision and the Governor's veto see Laughlin, pp. 39, 175. The Laughlin book calls attention to the great interest in sterilization being displayed in Germany in the early 1920s—see p.120.
15. Laughlin, *op. cit.,* pp. 446–47.
16. J.H. Landman, *Human Sterilization: The History of the Sexual Sterilization Movement* (New York, 1932, Macmillan, pp. 97–99, 104, 113); J.B.S. Haldane, *Heredity and Politics* (New York,

1938, Norton, p.15); Haldane's quotation of Holmes is not fully accurate.

17. Popenoe later was an ardent defender of Nazi racist practice and theory. Harry Laughlin, whose 1922 book we have cited earlier, was awarded an honorary doctorate in medicine by the University of Heidelberg in 1936—see, Kenneth M. Lumerer, *Genetics and American Society: An Historical Appraisal* (Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1972, p.118).
18. Thus, Leon F. Whitney, *The Case for Sterilization* (New York, 1934, Stokes) and Lothrop Stoddard, *Into the Darkness: Nazi Germany Today* (Duell, Sloan & Pearce, New York, 1940). Of course, Hitler found the racist laws in the United States as useful precedents for his own legislation of that type. Similar defenses of Hitler's practices appeared in Britain; especially advocated was "compulsory sterilization as a punishment for parents who have to resort to public assistance in order to support their children"—this from Professor MacBride in *Nature* (1936), quoted by Haldane, *op. cit.*, p.129.

PART IV. RACISM AND ITS REMEDIES

RACISM, ANTI-SEMITISM, AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

A lead in the campaign against affirmative action has been taken by several Jewish organizations and intellectuals—i.e., the American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Committee, B'nai B'rith, *Commentary*, Albert Shanker, Nathan Glazer. This reflects the "bourgeoisification" of elements among Jewish people, with its intense nationalism, apologies for aggression and occupation of other peoples' lands, alliances with reaction (à la Kissinger and the Nixon Administration) and a resurgent racism. Just as Israel's reactionary policy of aggression, expansion and occupation threatens war and endangers the existence of Israel, so the reactionary and racist positions of the above-named Jewish organizations and individuals carry with them encouragement to fascistic tendencies and therefore to anti-Semitism—thus directly endangering Jews as Jews.

Let us examine the arguments brought forth against affirmative action, systematized in Professor Glazer's book, *Affirmative Discrimination* (1975) and reiterated by most of the propaganda organs of the ruling class.

1. That racism is something that existed in the past and that it is wrong to practice affirmative action now when the proper source for such action, if such ever existed, has been eliminated.

To argue against this is almost insulting. This nation is steeped in racism; racism is a chronic, organic and institutionalized feature of the U.S. social order. Every significant component of life reflects this fact: the unemployment rate among Black people is three times that among white people (among other specially oppressed peoples, such as Chicanos and Puerto Ricans, it is also significantly higher than among white people), income is 40 percent lower, longevity is some five to ten years lower, the rate of illiteracy is three times higher.[1]

Black people today constitute less than 2 percent of the physicians in the nation, 2 percent of the dentists, 1.5 percent of the attorneys, 1.5 percent of the state police, and less than 2 percent of the college graduates. The figures for other victims of racism are comparable. And the data for victims of sexism are almost as bad.

Racism Intensifying

Furthermore, not only does racism characterize this society now, but the repression characteristic of racism is intensifying and the absolute and relative position of victims of racism is *worse* today than ten years ago.

2. That affirmative action penalizes merit. Again, an absurd argument. Racism is an instrument for penalizing merit. It places awful obstacles before its victims and then tells them to go forth and compete in the rat race that is capitalism. That is the meaning of the percentages just cited.

Affirmative action, seeking to break down the barriers created by racism, is a device to make merit have more meaning. It is supremely ironic for the opponents of affirmative action to attack it on the grounds that it threatens a merit system, as though in this society with its class character, its racism, its sexism, its generalized corruption, its influence peddling, merit really characterizes the selection of its leading figures, of the figures affirmed by the bourgeoisie to be "outstanding!" The argument against affirmative action on the basis of its violating merit is itself meretricious.

3. That affirmative action treats groups and that public policy and the law properly should deal with individuals. This is absurd. Racism is the assertion that an entire people are innately inferior to other peoples; it is the practice of discrimination and special oppression of a people as a whole bulwarked by that falsehood. It was not a Black *person* who was enslaved; the Black *people* were enslaved and law in the days of slavery assumed that a Black person, being Black, was a slave. The burden was upon such a person to prove his or her free status by special papers for that purpose. The whole legal and extra-legal system of practices maintaining a racist society is aimed not against individuals but against victimized peoples as a whole. This argument again is not only false but also ironic since one of the demands of victims of racism is precisely that they be considered as individuals and be dealt with accordingly.

Racist Intent

4. Opponents of affirmative action, including judges in more and more frequent decisions lately, declare that a necessary element in the proof of racism and discrimination is the presence of the intention to discriminate; that to show racist practice one must prove racist motivation.

This places an insuperable obstacle before the foes of racism. In a larger sense, in any case, motivation is irrelevant to social and

historical inquiry. Hitler, should he have sought entry into heaven, might well have told a startled Saint Peter that his motives were pure; that he really believed the Soviet Union was as he described it, that Communism was what he said it was and that Jews really were agents of the devil and that believing all this, he acted as he did in what he thought were the best interests of humanity! That, for example, the crematoria were huge sewerage projects. All this, however, constitutes a problem for Saint Peter, not a social analyst. The latter is not concerned with Hitler's motivations nor with Hitler personally; he is concerned with Hitlerism, with Nazism, with fascism and the sources, purposes, program and actions of that system.

Racism is not simply an idea, it is basically a practice. A racist society, such as that existing in the U.S., shows the statistics mentioned earlier in this essay and well known to anyone who knows anything about this country. Reality affirms racism's existence. Therefore, the basic approach to any effort to combat it must be an approach that seeks to transform reality. This means the accomplishment of changes that are subject to measurement in earnings, health, longevity, and jobs. This requires affirmative action.

5. Opponents of affirmative action cry out that it entails burdening our society with a "quota" system. This has been a favorite argument of *Commentary* and of Albert Shanker, both of whom use it demagogically for their predominantly Jewish constituency. Historically, of course, Jews were victims of this kind of "quota" system in Europe and in the United States; indeed, there are industries today in the United States, such as banking and public utilities, in which Jews still are subjected to discriminatory treatment that results in the old-fashioned "quotas."

Quotas to Include

But the purpose of affirmative action and the present demand for quotas or ratios or percentages is exactly the opposite of the old "quota" system that Shanker waves as a device to frighten the uninformed. That "quota" system set *maximum* ratios; the purpose of affirmative action and its quota requirement is to achieve minimum goals. The old "quota" system sought to keep out; the present statistics offered earlier in this essay show the existence here of the old "quotas" for the racially oppressed. This result of racism is the reality which affirmative action seeks to change. Indeed, the quota demand of those who favor affirmative action is exactly the opposite of the "quota" system which characterized anti-Semitism and racism, and characterizes them today.

In this sense, just as affirmative action is not "reverse discrimination" but is, rather, a way to reverse discrimination, so affirmative action does not seek to institute a "quota" system but is, rather, a method for the elimination of "quotas"; the quota demand of affirmative action is a way to eliminate the "quotas" now characterizing our society.

Affirmative action and its demand for results that can be shown statistically, that mean movement toward equalizing conditions of all peoples in this nation, is a fundamental one at this moment in history.

Three Phases

There have been three main phases in the history of the Black liberation movement: a) the struggle against slavery, meaning to move from property to person; b) for ninety years after emancipation, to move from second-class citizenship to full (legal) citizenship—i.e., the civil rights struggle; c) to move from full (legal) citizenship to equality in living conditions. Each of these were, of course, but stages or phases in the liberation effort, not the conclusion of that effort. With the achievement *on paper* of first-class citizenship, phase (c), the present one, is the effort to achieve equality in living conditions. Of course, historically, there were not neat divisions in the struggle, and throughout history, the effort to achieve full equality in all senses was always present, but different eras had different conditions and so necessarily had different emphases.

At the present stage, pieces of paper, commission inquiries and pious promises about "bettering opportunities" will not do. Today it is a question of bread and butter, income, jobs, health, education, professional achievement, and housing. Now it is a matter of full equality in fact, in life. Certainly, that and only that is the test for the effectiveness of the struggle against racism.

Finally, what does affirmative action mean for white people and especially white men? Why is it so important for us to support affirmative action in our own interests?

First of all, the social problems in this country, for example, the crisis of the cities, afflict all of us. It is necessary only to name problems such as unemployment, housing, transportation, health, education, inflation, pollution, to understand that none of these can be even tackled, let alone solved, without facing up to the fact of racism. If racism is basic to the crisis in our society, then clearly all exploited members of that society have an urgent interest in combatting that racism. The fact is that none of the problems mentioned can be solved if racism is ignored; and the ignoring of

racism, being itself chauvinist, guarantees the failure of the effort.

Secondly, opponents of affirmative action are wedded to an economy of scarcity and proceed on the basis of a limited-size pie with all of us avidly competing against each other for a slice. Affirmative action rejects such an outmoded and reactionary orientation and is not satisfied with the present monopoly-created limitations on the numbers of our schools, hospitals, jobs and homes. This by no means justifies holding back on affirmative action until such an alteration occurs; on the contrary, it means that the battle for affirmative action is one which seeks justice for victims of racism now and one which in that quest simultaneously brings forth the urgent need for a shift in the priorities and purposes of our economy.

Unity Necessary

If we are to have a social order which feeds the people and starves the Pentagon, we must have a basic shift in the dominant political orientation in our country. We must have, in other words, a break from the one-class, two-party system; we must develop a mass-based, effective people's party of an antimonopoly character. How can such a political change be brought about if one does not forge unity with the over *50 million* racially and nationally oppressed peoples in this country—the Black people, the Puerto Rican, Chicano, Native American Indian, Asian-American peoples? Added to this is the fact that women, who constitute almost fifty percent of the working population, face the discrimination known as sexism and that today, as in the past, the struggle against racism and the struggle against sexism are integrally related.

Therefore, in terms of self-interest for white people, and especially white men, the battle for affirmative action is a battle which will earn the support of the racially and sexually oppressed and thus assure the kind of unity without which it is absurd to talk realistically of changing the present political system dominated by big business and its parties.

For the labor movement, the bosses' prime weapons for dividing the working class have been racism and sexism. Fundamental to revitalizing the trade union movement is the fight against these boss-created and -fostered poisons. Disunity serves the boss; unity serves the workers. Affirmative action as a basic weapon against racism and sexism is therefore important to overcoming disunity in the working class and furthering the organization of the unorganized (notably in the South).

Finally, only such a movement has the potential of hurling back

reaction in this country; and the growing danger of reaction is universally admitted. In this country, with its deep racism, its monopoly character, this tendency towards the right has the clear potential of fascism.

Jewish people surely must understand by now the pressing danger to them as Jews that exists with the rise of reaction and the threat of fascism. From this point of view, quite apart from what is just, Jews must see it as a matter of pressing self-interest to support affirmative action passionately as part of the cleansing and forward-moving force in our land.

We conclude, then, by affirming that today those who wish to defeat reaction, who want to turn back the forces making for war and intensified racism, should see the organic relationship between the struggle for affirmative action and the struggle for general progress.

Editors' note: Another article on affirmative action by the author, "Affirmative Action: A Response to Critics," appeared in *Political Affairs*, June 1981, pp. 23–32.

NOTES

1. The death rate at childbirth for Black women is three times greater than for white women (does this trouble the "Right-to-Life" folks?).

RACISM, FASCISM, AND HUMAN RIGHTS

We believe that defending freedom of speech for Nazis and Ku Kluxers is wrong. We understand that many people hold that, on the contrary, the rights of all must be protected and that any exception to this is violative of the Bill of Rights, and may have a dangerous and reactionary impact upon society in general and radical advocates in particular. We know that many such people are perfectly straightforward and believe themselves to be as intensely antagonistic to the tenets of the Nazis and the Kluxers as we are. And we certainly understand that this is true of our distinguished colleague this evening, Professor Chevigny, and AIMS greatly appreciates his participation in this event.[1]

We believe that Nazis and Ku Kluxers have no rights—in terms of proposing and forwarding their objectives—that any decent person or society should respect. On the contrary, their proposals and aims are so repulsive, false and anti-human that allowing them freedom to promulgate those ideas is a disservice to real human freedom and well-being. It is as though one argued for the freedom of the wolf though it meant the death of the sheep, or argued for the freedom of the slaveowner to continue enjoying his peculiar property in the name of his freedom to do so, or insisting upon his freedom—or anybody else's freedom—to urge the enslavement of Black people. The XIII Amendment, which abolished slavery and confiscated without compensation several billions of dollars worth of private property, terminated the freedom of the slaveowner.

It is absurd to abolish slavery and allow its advocacy; it is not only absurd, it is vicious and dangerous to do so. And the rationalization for slavery was racism. There is no more reason to tolerate racist argumentation in the name of freedom than to tolerate enslavement of Black people in the name of the freedom of others to possess slaves.

Racism is built upon falsehood and outright forgery—from the forged experiments of Robert Bean at the beginning of this century to the forgeries of Sir Cyril Burt as recently as the late 1960s and

early 1970s.

The Protocols of the Elders of Zion is a forgery; there is no doubt about the fact. It also is one of the well-springs of anti-Semitism for which just fifty years ago Henry Ford devoted a fortune; it was distributed in Nazi Germany by the millions. It is printed today in the U.S. and is still widely dispersed (just the other day I saw a person reading it on the subway in New York City). That is a criminal publication; it is a lie and a proven lie; its publication is not only an act of falsification but also of clear and deliberate provocation. Not only is the provocation aimed at insulting an entire people; it is aimed at annihilating an entire people. When I lectured recently under the auspices of the *Daily World* in Chicago, Nazis picketed the lecture hall; they carried signs stating: "Kill a Jew Today" and "Gas All Communists." That they were protected in their picketing was not a manifestation of freedom; it was a manifestation of a backward society where such messages are tolerated in the name of "freedom."

All of this is not a matter of theory or of a criminally insane group picketing a meeting. This is a matter of an outlook—this racism and anti-Semitism has resulted in oceans of blood and torment for hundreds of years of literally hundreds of millions of people. This racism is today in the U.S. and in other lands, as South Africa, the prop of a system of fascistic practices which is an abomination to the eyes and an atrocity to the senses of decent humanity. To permit the promulgation of such poison in the name of freedom is absurd and vicious.

I call to your attention the fact that in the U.S., the KKK was in power in a dozen states for almost a century after Reconstruction in this country. The KKK conquered states like Colorado and Ohio and Indiana in addition to southern states in the 1920s. The son-in-law of a president of the United States was an active KKK member at the same time that he was Secretary of the Treasury of the U.S. and very nearly became the Democratic candidate for president of the U.S. only fifty years ago. The Nazis conquered Germany and most of Europe only forty years ago; they rule today in Chile and in South Africa; there is again a Hitler cult in West Germany and there is the rise of a Nazi movement in the country. When we speak therefore of freedom for Nazis we are not speaking of some "miniscule" group—to quote the adjective of the *New York Times* (which defended their right to free speech); we are rather defending the right of those adhering to a philosophy which led to the death of over fifty million people and which almost conquered the world—and which today is in power in significant

nations on two continents.

Sometimes it is affirmed that those demanding that Nazis and Kluxers be called criminals in terms of spreading their ideas and organizational networks are the censors. I do not think so. I think that the racists are the censors. It is they who have hidden from most people the truth about Black and Puerto Rican and Chicano and Native American Indian history and culture. They are the censors: they who have made of our dominant texts and curricula displays of racism through sins both of omission and commission. Combatting racism is not censorship; it is one form of effective struggle against the dominant censorship which characterizes our society today.

Sometimes it is declared that this idea of making criminal the advocacy of views of Nazis and Kluxers is unprecedented or something done only by socialist states—and so presumably on its face wrong and "totalitarian." Actually in our own society through experience and struggle we do have laws and regulations forbidding the expression of racist and anti-Semitic ideas or desires. For instance, in many areas the placing of advertisements which are racially exclusive or hostile to certain religious affiliations is forbidden. You may not advertise in the *New York Times,* for example, and that newspaper is forbidden to publish an advertisement which states: "Only Whites Need Apply" or "No Irish Hired" or "Churches Nearby," etc. The freedom of landlords to so advertise or so control the use or renting of their properties also is denied by law. Not only do many political bodies in the U.S. have legislation banning racist and anti-Semitic writings and practices but many nations—including non-socialist nations—have such legislation. This is true of Great Britain, which makes criminal language which insults other peoples in racist terms. Noteworthy is the law in the Netherlands which has been in effect and has been effective for generations; Article 137c and of the Penal Code of the Netherlands states:

> Any propaganda or organization based on the theory of the superiority of one race or group of persons of one color or ethnic origin with a view to justify or promote racial discrimination, hatred or abuse; of any act of violence or incitement against any person or group of persons by reason of or reference to religious, racial or ethnic affiliation shall be considered an offense against society and punishable under law. A warning shall be given the persons involved that prosecution is intended.

By the Potsdam Treaty of 1945, signed by the victorious Allies—including the United States—the German people were forbidden the right to disseminate Nazi ideas. That Treaty specifically forbids to them all Nazi newspapers, books, propaganda, parties, uniforms, organizations, etc. Does this represent a deprivation of the freedom of the German people or does it represent rather the results of lessons humanity has learned and on the basis of such experience the enhancement of the actual dignity and rights and therefore actual freedom of humanity—including German people?

Is it not tragic that the provisions of the Potsdam Treaty have been enforced in only one of the two German states? Or is its enforcement in the German Democratic Republic proof of Marxism's and socialism's lack of freedom? Is it not tragic that in the German Federal Republic one has now what the Western press refers to as a Hitler boom or vogue? And that Nazi organizations, parties and propaganda are again being financed and again are flourishing?

Furthermore, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted unanimously by the General Assembly of the UN in December 1948, especially condemned discriminatory practices based upon racist ideas and urged that "by teaching and education" such ideas be overcome and such practices eliminated. The preamble to the Declaration affirmed that the rights enumerated in the resolution were of such a character that where a social order denied a substantial portion of them, man might feel "compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression." With this as a warning, the resolution was suggesting that it would be well if the rights were established so that this "last resort" would no longer threaten. In this thought and this warning the Declaration of 1948 reminds one of the Declaration of 1776, our own revolutionary birth certificate.

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted by the General Assembly of the UN in December 1966, provides in Article 20: "Any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence shall be prohibited by law." And in the resolution adopted by the United Nations International Conference on Human Rights held in May 1968, paragraph 8 reads as follows:

> The peoples of the world must be made fully aware of the evils of racial discrimination and must join in combatting them. The implementation of this principle of non-discrimination, embodied in the Charter of the UN, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and other international instruments in the field of human rights, constitutes a most urgent task of mankind at

the international as well as at the national level. All ideologies based in racial superiority and intolerance must be condemned and resisted.

Only ninety years ago an eminent U.S. physician, William A. Hammond, argued for the banning of women from politics; his argument appeared in one of the most prestigious journals of the time—the *North American Review* (July 1883). It consisted, in his words, of the following ideas: "The female brain is not only smaller than that of man, but it is different in structure . . . [there are] numerous and striking differences between them . . . [the woman's brain is one] from which emotion rather than intellect is evolved . . . the female brain besides being emotional is an imitative brain . . . woman cannot reason abstractly and cannot reason exactly . . . there is a peculiar neurotic condition called the hysterical which is ingrafted in the organization of the woman" and so on, ad infinitum, ad nauseam. I suppose there are Hammonds now in the United States; shall we offer them public facilities for the expounding and promulgating of these views?

It is only fifty years ago that Henry Ford through his *Dearborn Independent* spent millions of dollars publicizing the ideas and text of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion until public pressure forced him to cease and to promise to desist and indeed to publicly apologize for libeling an entire people. Shall we support a public debate as to the validity of the Protocols and their characterization of Jewish people? Were those who forced Ford to stop publicizing such ideas foes of freedom?

Are these matters of debate? Are these questions for scientific inquiry now as the twentieth century comes to a close? Or are these not historical curiosities, testimonials to human ingenuity in the service of exploitative, rotten and obsolete social systems?

Racism is no more a matter of debate than are Dr. Hammond's views on women, or Henry Ford's views on the Protocols of Zion. Racism's every tenet has been refuted without a shred of doubt. Racism was created to justify exploitation and oppression and in its name children have been tormented, women assaulted, men butchered and entire peoples crucified. This is not a matter of debate; it is a matter of outlawry.

Combatting Racism in the U.S.

Permit now a few brief allusions to the history of the effort to combat racism in the United States, as inspired by and in accordance with the charter of the UN and the Declaration of 1948 on Genocide and Human Rights.

At the tenth anniversary meeting of the National Negro Congress —which at one time represented in its affiliated organizations three million Black people—held in Detroit, May 30-June 2, 1946, the delegates voted to present a "Petition to the United Nations on Behalf of the [then] thirteen million oppressed Negro citizens of the USA," seeking, as it said, "the elimination of political, economic and social discrimination against Negroes in the United States."

The major part of that petition was a statement of proof in support of it; that was prepared at the request of the Congress by me. This was presented to the UN Secretary-General, Mr. Trygve Lie, in New York City on June 6, 1946, by a delegation consisting of Paul Robeson, Revels Cayton and the present writer. It went from there to the UN Economic and Social Council, but opposition from the U.S. delegation prevented its serious discussion. It was printed in one hundred thousand copies and sold throughout the U.S. and was reprinted in the millions in a dozen languages. In 1947, under the leadership of Dr. Du Bois—then back with the NAACP (briefly)—an appeal to the world in opposition to the racism in the U.S. was presented as a petition to the UN, with chapters detailing the facts in all areas of life and with an introduction by Dr. Du Bois. This received more publicity in the U.S. than the 1946 effort but again its consideration in the UN was blocked by the U.S. delegation with Mrs. Roosevelt playing a leading role in preventing its discussion.

In 1951 William L. Patterson, head of the Civil Rights Congress, took a book in the form of a petition to the appropriate committees' headquarters of the UN to Paris; this was the famous *We Charge Genocide* which created an international sensation by showing that the racism practiced in the U.S. violated several of the specific features of the antigenocide convention adopted by the UN in 1948 but not ratified by the U.S. This was at the height of the McCarthy terror in the U.S. and it was this act, as well as his whole radical life, which led soon thereafter to the jailing of Mr. Patterson for contempt of Congress, after the head of the Un-American Activities Committee had denounced Mr. Patterson as a "Black son-of-a-bitch" for refusing to show anything but contempt for that Committee of thieves, demagogues and racists.

The petitions of 1946 and 1947 and 1951 remain valid today. Details vary and some of these changes—especially the advances through the struggle against the gross forms of legal racism and the blatant peonage of the 1930s and 1940s—are important successes. But the main and central fact remains, as stated, that this is a land of ghettos and barrios and reservations; it is, indeed, the land constituting the most powerful bulwark of what remains of colonialism

and imperialism and therefore of the main intellectual facade of those systems of institutionalized superexploitation, namely the poison of racism.

It is this poison—further developed and refined as capitalism became monopoly capitalism and as the system reached its final stage of imperialism—which has been of inestimable service to those who have ruled the United States—of service in terms of political, economic, psychological and social realities vital to the maintenance of their rule and the profitability as well as stability of such rule. This is the root of racism and this is why it persists and is maintained despite mounting internal and international pressures against it.

The United States being one of the main homes of racism, and racism performing the vital functions for the ruling class that have been mentioned, ideologues in its service never fail to appear, no matter how often and how fully and compellingly the ideas and postulates of racism have been shown to be without any merit or substance whatsoever.

The history of racist ideology and its promulgation shows that it is never an *abstraction* but historically always has been part of a sustained campaign for intensified racist *practice*. Just as one example: the writings of Thomas Dixon, such as *The Klansmen*, and the creation of the movie based upon his writings, *Birth of A Nation*, came at a time when hundreds of Black people were being lynched each year, when the legalization and institutionalizing of Jim Crow triumphed and when the disfranchisement of the Black masses of the South was accomplished. *Birth of a Nation*, vile in its racism, was shown to tens of millions of people during and after World War I and played a part, without any doubt, in the slaughters of Black people that took the lives of hundreds in Tulsa, Oklahoma; Washington, D.C.; East St. Louis and Chicago, Illinois; Elaine, Arkansas and in Texas, Oklahoma and Georgia. It played a part in the appearance of a mass KKK which by 1920 had about five million members and was a powerful political force in such states as Maine, Ohio, Colorado and Indiana as well as throughout the South.

When therefore the NAACP—and Dr. Du Bois, in the first place—demanded the banning of *Birth of a Nation* and actively picketed theaters in an effort to prevent its showing, the NAACP was right and not wrong; it was seeking to prevent a curbing of human rights, an intensification of oppression. The banning of *Birth of a Nation* would have been a blow for freedom. Clearly it is not to argue for racism that freedom of speech exists.

All the world agrees that chattel slavery is wrong and all the

world has banned it. Most of the world agrees that racism is wrong and much of the world has banned it. In both cases, it is those who extirpated the evil and those who prohibit the poison who represent the best of humanity; they are the real and effective friends of actual human freedom.

The poison of racism was important in making Germany fall prey to fascism; this brought disaster to the people of Germany and the world. Would that Hitler's propaganda had been effectively banned *before* he became Chancellor of Germany! The poison of racism has infected the United States; it has already caused misery and suffering of untold dimensions. But its persistence makes the United States especially liable to fascism. A fascist Germany brought disaster to humanity; a fascist United States, given the realities of its power, means catastrophe first for us in the U.S. and then for all the world. With the meaning of Watergate it is clear that the tendency toward fascism is intense.

Nothing less than this is at stake as we consider how best to combat racism in our own country. Either it is extirpated or the extirpation of human life may well occur.

An effective element in that struggle is to understand that Nazis and Kluxers must not be free to spread their poisons.

NOTES

1. From a paper delivered at a symposium sponsored by the American Institute for Marxist Studies, New York City,January 23, 1978, published as "No Freedom of Speech for Nazis and the KKK," *Political Affairs*, April 1978. Here edited with "The Universal Declaration of Human Rights," *Political Affairs*, March 1974. Participating with Aptheker were Abraham J. Isserman and Prof. Paul Chevigny, who appeared at the request of the American Civil Liberties Union. Father William Stickney of St. Peter's Episcopal Church, New York City, was moderator.

PART V. PEACE AND JUSTICE

MOORFIELD STOREY: LESSONS FOR TODAY

The founding President of the American Anti-Imperialist League (1899) and of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (1910) was the same person—Moorfield Storey (1845–1929). In his youth he had served as Senator Charles Sumner's secretary; he was a member of Harvard's Board of Overseers for many years (1877–1907). His distinction as an attorney in Boston was so great that in 1895 he was elected President of the American Bar Association. A biography of such a figure cannot help but be of the greatest interest; it is somewhat surprising that the book[1] now being reviewed is only the second such biography to appear—the first being a rather old-fashioned "Life" by Mark A. DeWolfe Howe (published in 1932) and, especially because of its abundance of letters, not fully superseded by the present effort. Perhaps this neglect is not so surprising after all, for Storey was a man of deep integrity and profound Lincolnian convictions—obviously relevant in the 1930's and again currently but distressing to ruling circles, both in his own lifetime and today.

Indeed, as the author of this book tells us, in its preface, work upon it—as a doctoral dissertation at Columbia—commenced at the time of the March on Selma and U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic, events which made a study of Storey's life seem particularly relevant and exciting.

As Professor Hixson writes, the "decisive event" which determined much of Storey's public career was the outbreak of the Spanish-American War (1898); he saw its origins as tainted, its conduct as atrocious (especially in its aftermath—the "pacification" of the Filipino people), and its result—Washington launched on an open colonialist path—as disastrous. Following the best traditions of Lincoln and Douglass, he denounced his "own" government while it was waging war because he felt the war was wrong and that the urgent duty of a patriot, therefore, was one requiring open and effective opposition. He was joined in this, of course, by the best among his contemporaries such as Carl Schurz, Mark Twain and W. E. B. Du Bois. (It was, indeed, in connection with their common opposition to

U.S. imperialism and its actions in the Philippines that the Du Bois-Storey relationship commenced—to last with mutual respect until the latter's death, but this is not noted in Hixson's book.)

Storey's remarks in the course of his anti-imperialist efforts are so apt that it is not possible to resist fairly extensive quotations (one should add that the older Howe book is even richer than this one in that respect). Thus, in October 1900, he quoted a powerful Senator and war hawk as insisting: "We are not going to pull down the flag while it is being shot at. We have never done it, and never will." This was pure demagogic balderdash, Storey insisted. He said:

> This is a mere appeal to passion. Whether the flag is rightly resisted or not, whether some officer or agent of ours has wrongly attacked a peaceful neighbor or not, no matter how criminal our aggression, no matter how just the resistance,—if a shot is fired against us, this mighty nation in blind wrath must crush its opponents, not asking or caring whether it is right or wrong. This doctrine dethrones God, and makes a deity of bunting. . . .

On the same occasion, he named the then-President of the United States and two of the most influential senators of the period as repeating the cry "Our Country right or wrong" and insisting that with war a fact citizens had to support the constituted "authorities." No, said Storey, these momentary office-holders do not make up "my country." And further,

> I deny that they may commit us to a bloody and needless war, and then insist that those who oppose their policy are not patriots. The doctrine that the king can do no wrong has no place in a republic and no application to its servants. It has ever been a buttress of despotism.

In 1905, when it was argued, in racist terms, that the people of the Philippines were not "fit" to govern themselves, Storey demanded to know, "Who shall decide that such unfitness exists?" He continued:

> Can we be sure that the judgment of the strong is not affected by appeals to national vanity, by apostrophes to the flag, by hopes of commercial advantage, by dreams of world power, by the exigencies of party politics, by personal ambitions?

With the intervention in Latin America, especially Nicaragua, Haiti and the Dominican Republic, the N.A.A.C.P. officially and as

a body—with Storey, James Weldon Johnson and Du Bois in the forefront—took a determined anti-imperialist stand; this was important in that organization's official support of the Progressive Party candidacy of Robert M. La Follette in 1924. In a letter written that year by Storey to La Follette, and published in this book for the first time—and so fresh that with the change of this or that name it suits present needs exactly—we read:

> It has of late years been too common for the President of the United States in some emergency to use the military force of the United States without the consent of Congress, against nations with which we are at peace, as when we made war on China to rescue our legation, or when President Roosevelt used both army and navy against Colombia to seize the Panama Canal, or when our forces occupied Cuba, or now when they are in Haiti; and unless some protest is made these acts become thoroughly dangerous precedents. The people through their representatives have the right to decide whether they will go to war or not; and the President not only has no power to make the decision for them, but has no right to take steps which commit this country to war, so that the people cannot deliberately decide for or against it.

Four years later, with intervention and war being conducted in Nicaragua, Storey again insisted that the President had no right "to exercise any power not given to him, or to decide the question of war or peace which is expressly committed to Congress." "It is time," Storey added—back in 1928, "that usurpations such as these were characterized as they deserve, and that Congress assured the rights of the American people and protected the rights of friendly nations from abuse."

It is infinitely to Storey's credit, too, as the author does not fail to point out, that when the Secretary of State, Frank B. Kellogg, attempted to justify U.S. assaults with a memorandum to the Senate entitled "Bolshevist Aims and Policies in Latin America"—this in 1927, marking the first official use of the "Communist specter" in U.S. diplomacy—he tossed aside this "anti-Communist rhetoric" and added: "The oil interests are undoubtedly behind the activity of the State Department and would be glad to embroil us with Mexico."

Storey consistently kept his head when faced with the anti-Communism racket. The only high-ranking federal office-holder to resist and publicly oppose the red-baiting Palmer-Hoover raids of 1919–20 (this marked the beginning of the illustrious career of the late J. Edgar Hoover) was Louis F. Post, for a (short) time As-

sistant Secretary of Labor.[2] Post wrote of an aspect of the illegal and terroristic activities conducted by the Palmer-Hoover team in a volume called *The Deportation Delirium of 1920* and Storey wrote its foreword. He denounced the officials of the so-called Justice Department who "under pretense of enforcing the laws, trample on the Constitution" and concluded: "The safeguards of the Constitution were ignored, and any true American must blush at what was done. . . ."

Storey's opposition to Jim Crow at home was the other side of the coin of his opposition to imperialism and colonialism; he, himself, was quite conscious of the organic connection between both efforts. He was a defender of the need for equality of all peoples, and spoke out and actively struggled for the rights of Jews, Japanese, Irish Catholics, Armenians, American Indians; his main work, however, in this area both as an individual and as a leading official of the NAACP was to oppose all invidious distinctions whether in law or in practice aimed against the Afro-American people. In this connection, his prowess as an attorney was very important and in many of the seminal cases in civil rights until the close of the 1920's, Storey's role was outstanding. All this is told well by Professor Hixson.

There are certain areas of the book, however, which I feel are weak. This is especially apparent in Hixson's very scanty treatment of Du Bois and his erroneous treatment of him when he is noticed. He quotes Storey as saying that Du Bois in *The Crisis* "attacks Trotter and Washington impartially" but in this Storey was altogether wrong as Du Bois' feelings for Trotter were marked by enormous respect and regard. Hixson refers to Du Bois' "indulgence in personal vendettas," a characterization which is so false as to be startling; it is true, however, that Du Bois' white associates in the leadership of the NAACP (such as Villard) manifested a paternalistic attitude which he found most difficult to abide and they sometimes tended to view his reaction thereto as merely a piece of subjectivism. Hixson also writes, with apparent agreement, that Storey was "dubious about Du Bois' increasing glorification of *negritude*." From the 1890's on Du Bois had an intense sense of pride in his people and one of the particular efforts of his life was to make this clear and to make such a sense universal. So there was nothing "increasing" about this and there certainly was no "glorification." Further, there never was in Du Bois' insistence upon self-pride and self-confidence and the need for inner development any semblance of invidiousness towards any other people. On the contrary, where Du Bois labored especially and quite naturally in

terms of Afro-American and African peoples he always did so—and always made this explicit— with the understanding that such an effort was and had to be part of an effort to enhance the rights and capacities of all humanity, especially of those who labored and suffered exploitation, whatever their color or national origins.

To the degree that Du Bois' white colleagues—like Villard and Mary White Ovington and Storey—did not comprehend all this, to that degree working with them never was easy for Du Bois; but the failure was theirs not his and the failure to understand this is Professor Hixson's.

Professor Hixson refers to the white people among the founders of the NAACP as "liberals." This is very common but it is not accurate. Some among them might be so characterized and certainly this fits Storey. But most of the leading white founders of the NAACP (and most of those who were Black, too) were not "liberals" in their time and place and were not so considered by organs like the *New York Times*, not to speak of the white southern press. They were radicals; radical in their rejection of dominant racist features and radical in that so many of them were Socialists—people like Mary White Ovington, Charles Edward Russell, William English Walling, for example. (As were many among the Black founders—as Du Bois, J. Milton Waldron, George Frazier Miller, for example.)

The author does point out, at the close of his volume, that Storey paid attention only to the "denial of political rights" and that he did not comprehend, let alone do anything about, "social and economic oppression." Of course, the second impinges upon and cannot be separated from the first; in addition, Storey (and to a lesser degree Villard also) viewed the NAACP effort as one which might complement what he viewed as Booker T. Washington's effort to help Black people accumulate property. For, as he said, Black people needed not only to acquire property to be fully functioning citizens but they also had to have the rights to their property fully protected if they themselves were not to become a "dangerous" element in society—i.e., a threat to a society based upon the private ownership of the means of production—an arrangement whose wisdom and "naturalness" never was questioned by Storey.[3] This conservative strain, which Hixson hints at when he refers to concern only for "political" rights, was to grow as a basic element in the accumulating estrangement between Du Bois and the board of the NAACP, both in the break that occurred in 1934 and that which occurred a dozen years later.

The approach summarized above is connected with Hixson's

tendency to present the Abolitionist movement as not only "middleclass" as he writes, but also white, as he assumes. This misconception of the Abolitionist movement is consequential to the volume as a whole, since, as the title of the book states, he is considering Storey "and the Abolitionist tradition." But he makes that movement, in so many words, a reformist one; further, he insists that it was "not even reformist on any other issue." The latter is an extraordinary error, for of course, most of the Abolitionist leaders – white and Black – were very active in such movements as those to enhance the rights of women and to eliminate war. But, deeper, the Abolitionist movement was a Black-white revolutionary one, not a reformist one; by missing this, one falsifies that movement and vitiates what is called "the Abolitionist tradition."

It is this basically conservative strain – insofar as property relationships are concerned – which explains Storey's insistence on the need for "obedience to the law" – to which Hixson devotes a section of this volume. In 1904, speaking before the Maryland Bar Association, Storey remarked: "The history of civilization is the record of the struggle between might and right, between force and law." In this equation of the "right" with the "law" and in this divorcing of "force" from the "law" Storey was demonstrating the glaring limitations of his class position and the utterly mythical conceptions of the state normally associated with such a class position. It is this, again, which manifests itself in Storey's opposition to the closed shop for workers and his ridiculous idea that such a shop was analogous to requiring that all workers belong to one church or one political party! This, too, is fundamental, I think, to Storey's insistence that Sacco-Vanzetti had had a "fair" trial and that the mass agitation to reverse the sentence of death was ill-advised. Here the author allows himself to be very gentle indeed with Storey, but the literature on Sacco-Vanzetti (despite some recent neo-Conservative work) has demonstrated conclusively the frame-up character of the case against the carpenter and the fish-peddler and the political motivations behind the killing of the two radicals.

These are weaknesses in Storey (and to a degree in Hixson's rendition of him) but the man still emerges as the kind of bourgeois democrat to whom Lenin referred with respect and regard (even though with deep criticism, of course) in his classical *Imperialism.*

In many of the main battles of his time, Storey was on the side of the angels – that is to say on the side of the masses and the side of democracy, equality & PEACE. The limitations were severe but the inhibitions natural to a man of his origins and class were

enormous; still to an infinitely greater degree than most suffering from such origins and ties he moved towards a humanistic and egalitarian posture. When he was eighty years old he noted that he had seen with joy the abolition of slavery throughout the world and the falling of crowns from the heads of emperors in Russia and Germany and Turkey. And he affirmed that the United States must not be permitted to impede human progress. We must, he said, "persevere in asserting our rights and we cannot be beaten." Good words for a man or woman of eighty—or twenty. On the whole, Moorfield Storey had so conducted his life that he was able, without hypocrisy, to offer this advice to those who were to follow him.

NOTES

1. William B. Hixson, Jr., *Moorfield Storey and the Abolitionist Tradition,* Oxford University Press, New York, 1972, 256 pp.
2. While there are now two biographies of Storey, there is no biography of Louis Post, who also was an early member of both the Anti-Imperialist League and of the NAACP; it is badly needed.
3. I have developed this point, with particular reference to Storey (and Villard and Albert Bushnell Hart), in my *Afro-American History: The Modern Era* (Citadel Press, New York, 1971), chapter 9.

W. E. B. DU BOIS AND AFRICA

The life of William Edward Burghardt Du Bois (1868–1963) was devoted fundamentally to eliminating racism in the world. Bearing in mind how widespread that poison was during his lifetime, how deeply imbedded it was in the nature of dominant social systems and its great consequence to the wealth and power of exploitative ruling classes, it is clear that Du Bois had selected a powerful adversary.

Du Bois, as an Afro-American growing up in late nineteenth century United States and living both in the North and in the South, daily felt upon his own flesh and soul—and that of his family and friends—the impact of this poison. He began his crusade then with his own people and his own country; he soon realized, however, that the ideology and practice of racism was worldwide. The realization came with a comprehension of its strength in Latin America, in Africa and in Asia. He saw, then, that the effort at the liberation of Black people in the United States was part of a global effort to eliminate the special oppression and exploitation of peoples of color; by the first decade of the twentieth century he realized, as he stated in 1907, that the liberation of the colored peoples of the world was part of the vast movement for the emancipation of the working classes of the world.

Du Bois concentrated upon the condition of his own people in the first place and that of colored people everywhere as a logical consequence thereof, but he never thought of this in any exclusionary sense or with any invidious content. Du Bois had enormous pride in his own people but that pride was part of his wonder at the magnificence of human beings in general and his confidence in the splendid life they could create when freed of exploitative social systems that breed, need and sustain divisive concepts, laws and practices. To eliminate the specially onerous oppression and exploitation of men and women of color (and Du Bois early called attention to the frightful suppression of women, in particular) was part of the necessary effort to eliminate inequality and injustice confronting all who—bereft of the means of production—worked for those holding in their private possession the wealth and producing capacity of the world.

Africa is a refrain in Du Bois' life from its earliest moments until its end, after ninety-five stirring and fruitful years. He remembered to the end of his days the melody of the sounds of an African lullaby his grandmother sang to him in his infancy, and he lies buried in Ghana—in the soil of that West Africa from which certain of his ancestors had been torn by slavetraders centuries ago.

As a young man in his twenties he devoted the ten minutes allotted to him at the 1890 commencement ceremonies at Harvard to explaining to the distinguished white audience what made "Jefferson Davis a Representative American"—namely his energy, drive, lack of compassion and brutal vigor for self-advancement—and suggesting what the African component in America could offer—unselfishness, warmth, composure, neighborliness and above all, he said, the value and dignity of service to others.

His doctoral dissertation, accepted at Harvard in 1895 and published as Harvard Historical Studies No. 1 the next year, examined *The Suppression of the African Slave Trade to the United States of America, 1638–1870;* it remains the classic exposition of its subject and was the first scientific work in Afro-American history. Basically a scrupulously documented collection of data, it is not devoid of value judgment, which Du Bois always insisted could not be omitted from true scientific endeavor. Its final chapter condemns the "cupidity and carelessness" of those in power in the United States; its closing words are: " . . . we may conclude that it behooves nations as well as men to do things at the very moment when they ought to be done."

In his address before the American Negro Academy, entitled "The Conservation of Races" and delivered in 1897, Du Bois pointed to the emergence of unifying movements among various peoples of the earth—he named the Japanese and the Slavic peoples—and urged that the same effort at unity was required of the Afro-American. Here is first projected Du Bois' famous concept of the "twoness" of the Afro-American: "Am I an American or am I a Negro?" His reply is that the Afro-American is *sui generis* and is one of the great peoples of the earth which, through unity and collective consideration, must lead in working out their own destiny. Here, too, he projects the concept of Pan-Negroism, as he called it then, and urged that the millions of Afro-Americans see themselves as part of a coming unity of African peoples in the world.

It was in the very year of the delivery of the address that Henry Sylvester-Williams, born in Trinidad the same year as Du Bois, founded an African Association in London, where Sylvester-Williams practiced law. This Association projected the idea of holding what it termed a "Pan-African Conference"; this finally eventuated in the

convening of such a conference in London, at the Westminster Town Hall, July 23–25, 1900. Present were some thirty Black men and women from the United States, Haiti, Abyssinia, Liberia, the British West Indies and West Africa.

The Lord Bishop of London welcomed the delegates at the opening ceremonies and, according to Du Bois, "a promise was obtained from Queen Victoria, through Joseph Chamberlain"—then Colonial Secretary—not to "overlook the interest and welfare of the native races."

Sylvester-Williams served as general secretary of this conference; its president was Alexander Walters, Bishop of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church; Du Bois (who had been in Paris in charge of the "Negro Section" of the United States exhibit at the World's Fair held earlier that year in Paris) was chairman of the Committee on Address. His words were issued in the name of the conference under the title, "To the Nations of the World." Here first appears Du Bois' famous statement that the color line is the problem of the twentieth century—then just dawning. It appears in this context:

> The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color-line, the question as to how far differences of race—which show themselves chiefly in the color of the skin and the texture of the hair—will hereafter be made the basis of denying to over half the world the right of sharing to their utmost ability the opportunities and privileges of modern civilization.

In this 1900 appeal also appears a paragraph containing matter central to Du Bois' thinking for the next six decades:

> The modern world must remember that in this age when the ends of the world are being brought so near together, the millions of black men in Africa, America, and the Islands of the Sea, not to speak of the brown and yellow myriads elsewhere, are bound to have a great influence upon the world in the future, by reason of sheer numbers and physical contact. If now the world of culture bends itself toward giving Negroes and other dark men the largest and broadest opportunity for education and self-development, then this contact and influence is bound to have a beneficial effect upon the world and hasten progress. But if, by reason of carelessness, prejudice, greed and injustice, the Black world is to be exploited and ravished and degraded, the results must be deplorable if not fatal—not simply to them, but to the high ideals of justice, freedom and

> culture which a thousand years of Christian civilization have held before Europe.

In this address, specific proposals followed for various areas of the world; for the United States there is this paragraph:

> Let not the spirit of Garrison, Phillips and Douglass wholly die out in America; may the conscience of a great nation rise and rebuke all dishonesty and unrighteous oppression toward the American Negro, and grant to him the right of franchise, security of person and property, and generous recognition of the great work he has accomplished in a generation toward raising nine millions of human beings from slavery to manhood.

Bishop Walters delivered a paper devoted to the 1900 London meeting to the 1901 gathering of the American Negro Academy—this at a time when Du Bois was president of the Academy. One year later, in March 1902, a printed prospectus for the African Development Company was issued from a Philadelphia office and signed by T. J. Minton, chairman, Du Bois, secretary, and H. T. Kealing, treasurer. The purpose was to raise a capital stock of $50,000; the stated aim was: "To acquire land in East Central Africa to be used for the cultivation of coffee and other products; to establish and maintain the means for transport by land, river, lakes and ocean; to establish and maintain trading stations, and to develop the natural resources of the lands acquired." This prospectus stated that "tne promoter" possessed "contracts with certain native chiefs for valuable concessions of land." Du Bois' papers show a continuing interest in African affairs thereafter, but this African Development Company seems never to have reached the stage of incorporation, let alone actual operation. It remains rather mysterious, but it certainly shows great interest in Africa and its development and in some respects reminds one of the early plans of Marcus Garvey to be announced in a later generation.

In November 1904, in Liverpool, England, the Ethiopian Progressive Association was founded; in March 1905 a revised version of its constitution and bylaws was published. In that form a copy went to Du Bois from the secretary of the association, Kwesi Ewusi, of the Gold Coast colony. The asociation had twenty founding members, from England, Sierra Leone, Lagos, Fernando Po, Barbados, Jamaica, Cuba, the Gold Coast and South Africa.

Its objects were reminiscent of Du Bois' 1900 call "To the Nations of the World": to develop friendship among Africans in England; to "create a bond of union" among all African peoples; to "raise the

social status" of all Africans; to "strengthen the friendly relations" among them and all other peoples; and "to discuss . . . matters of vital importance concerning Africa in particular, and the Negro race in general."

In 1905 was founded, under the leadership of Du Bois and the very militant William Monroe Trotter, the Niagara Movement, uniting a broad spectrum of Black professionals and intelligentsia who demanded full equality for Black people in contradistinction to the Booker T. Washington program of acquiescence in second-class citizenship. The concept of Pan-Africanism was present in the original calls written by Du Bois and at the 1906 annual meeting of this movement the constitution was amended to add among its fourteen standing committees one called "The Pan-African Department."

To further the purposes of the Niagara Movement, Du Bois founded a monthly magazine, *The Moon*, printed in Memphis, Tennessee. This began in December 1905 and terminated in July 1906; very few copies survive. One that does, dated March 2, 1906, contains a regular department, conducted by Du Bois, "Tidings of the Darker Millions," which devoted itself to news of African and African-derived peoples around the world. This particular account emphasized reports of important uprisings in South Africa against colonial rule; it reflects Du Bois' constant concern to bring news of the actual activities and desires of African people themselves to the attention of an audience in the United States.

From 1898 to 1913 Du Bois directed the Atlanta University conferences devoted to questions confronting Black people especially in the United States. Characteristically, however, discussion of areas beyond the United States was encouraged by Du Bois; in this connection a seminal event occurred at the 1906 conference wherein, at Du Bois' invitiation, the great anthropologist Franz Boas delivered a paper forthrightly attacking ideas of racism and bringing forward significant data on the consequence of African civilizations and their pioneering contributions to the well-being of humanity. This paper—and similar work by the pioneer Black historian Leo Hansberry—were very influential in Du Bois' thinking and he repeatedly paid tribute to their impact upon his own development.

From January 1907 through February 1910, Du Bois edited—along with L. M. Hershaw and F. H. Murray—a monthly magazine, *The Horizon*, which served as the organ of the Niagara Movement. In addition to contributing poetry and short stories to this magazine, Du Bois was in charge of a department called "The Overlook" which devoted itself to reporting major developments throughout the world impinging upon African and African-derived peoples. In

the first number of *The Horizon* Du Bois called attention to the "shameful" exploitation of African peoples by Western capital, including, he added, some from the United States, especially Rockefeller, and warned: "The day of reckoning is coming." Thereafter, no issue of *Horizon* failed to observe African developments. Thus that of February 1907 reported on the "exploitation of the native West Africans" by "organized, ruthless and ruling capital backed by greed." Issues called attention to the work of such African leaders as Casely Hayford and Edward Blyden. In the issue dated November-December 1908, Du Bois wrote of the desirability of a vast "Pan-African movement" because "The need of Liberia, the cause of Haiti, the cause of South Africa is our cause, and the sooner we realize this the better."

Not only did *The Horizon*, as the organ of the Niagara Movement, pay great attention to African developments; it is a fact that one of the departments in that movement was called "Pan-African," reflecting Du Bois' early and basic commitment to this effort.

Related is the fact that at least as early as 1909, Du Bois had conceived of the publication of what he then called an Encyclopedia Africana. Stationery with this heading was printed and he actively sought scholarly participation throughout the world; in this he was quite successful but at this time—as later—he was never able to find the funds to bring this great idea into actual existence. He was to return to this effort in the 1930s, with some encouragement from the Phelps-Stokes Fund, but other than the publication of two editions, in the 1940s, of a kind of annotated index and selected bibliographical guide, that project under those auspices also failed to materialize. It was only with coming into being of an independent Ghana, headed by Du Bois' disciple, Kwame Nkrumah, that the Encyclopedia project could again be taken up seriously. It was to direct this project—and bring into being the vision of his young manhood—that Du Bois, despite the hostility of the U.S. State Department, went to Ghana in 1961. With the able assistance of the very conscientious Dr. Alphaeus Hunton, this project was considerably advanced by the time Du Bois died, in his 95th year in August 1963. There is indication, despite a most unfortunate hiatus of more than a decade, that something approaching the vision of Du Bois will yet materialize.

The single most sustained and, in many ways, most significant of the manifold activities of Du Bois was his leadership in the founding, in 1910, of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and his editorship of its monthly magazine, *The Crisis*, from its first number, November 1910, until his resignation

from the NAACP in the summer of 1934.

The *Crisis,* as Du Bois' *Moon* and *Horizon,* paid careful attention to the history, culture and art of Africa during the generation that Du Bois guided it. In the first number of *Crisis,* in his column, "What to Read," he called attention to eleven articles dealing with Africa in various magazines and out of a total of twenty books Du Bois felt his readers should know about, in that first number, nine had as their subject some aspect of the life and history of Africa. In that first *Crisis,* also, Du Bois described at some length a conference devoted to Africa held earlier in 1910 at Clark University in Massachusetts where Black and white scholars delivered papers on "The Contributions of the Negro to Human Civilization" as well as others treating of some aspect of reality in the Belgian Congo, Liberia, French Africa and British Africa. To cite other instances of this constant theme in Du Bois' *Crisis*: its issue of June 1912 called attention to the recent death of D. J. Lenders, a leader of the African Political Organization in South Africa, and Du Bois commended Mr. Lenders as a militant fighter "for full political and civil rights to all." In an editorial in the issue of August 1913 Du Bois excoriated domination in South Africa "by means of theft, disfranchisement and slavery"; he denounced the oppression of "the voteless and voiceless Blacks who toil for dividends to support luxurious restaurants and churches and automobiles in London and New York." The issue of May 1922 pays great attention to a current strike of workers in South Africa; this was characteristic of Du Bois' editorship, for his *Crisis* was one of the very few publications in the United States to carry such news. In the September 1930 issue Du Bois characterized the South African regime as "barbarous." And in the December 1933 issue—shortly before Du Bois resigned his editorship—details concerning South African oppression again are offered and Du Bois concludes with the rhetorical question: "Who is civilized in South Africa and who is not?"

Thereafter, in Du Bois' writings for newspapers and periodicals, this theme of protesting colonialism and racism in Africa and especially South Africa recurs. Thus, in the 1940s Du Bois conducted a weekly column devoted entirely to news from Africa in Adam Clayton Powell's newspaper in Harlem called *People's Voice.* Quite typical of Du Bois' writings here was his column dated October 14, 1947, where he described South Africa as "this medieval slave-ridden oligarchy" which is ludicrously "placed in the front ranks of the 'democracies' of the world." Again, in the issue of December 20, 1947, one finds Du Bois denouncing "the racist, anti-democratic

and intensely exploitative situation" in South Africa.

In *New Africa*, the organ of the Council on African Affairs—which Du Bois co-chaired with Paul Robeson from 1948 on—dated January 1949, Du Bois again condemns the "oppressive and racist rule" in South Africa and urges "effective action by the United Nations and the creation of a democratic society in South Africa." Du Bois' article in the periodical, dated May-June 1950, was headed "Repression Madness Rules South Africa." Here it was noted that *New Africa* was banned in South Africa; Du Bois writes that he is certain that within the next fifty years the Black majority in South Africa would "take over this wretched and reactionary section of the world and make it into a new democratic state." Many of his columns in the then-progressive weekly, the *National Guardian*, published in New York City, were devoted in the 1950s to African history and especially the struggles of the African peoples. In one of its final columns, published September 20, 1960, a year before his departure for Ghana, Du Bois warned that if "racism and superexploitation persist" in South Africa that "may well be the place wherein a new world war begins."

These newspaper columns were necessarily very brief. Du Bois was one of the earliest authors in the United States who managed to publish in leading journals full-length and critical examinations of the colonialism that characterized European and United States relations with Africa. Two of these essays have assumed really classical positions in the relevant literature.

First there is the remarkable essay on "The African Roots of the War" published in the *Atlantic Monthly* for May 1915. With the hindsight provided us by the passage of sixty-five years one detects in this essay a certain philosophic idealism and politically a certain classlessness and therefore a kind of naivete and moral exhortation; but then one must recall that this analysis appeared two years prior to Lenin's *Imperialism* and that one would be hard put to find so incisive an examination of its subject matter in any language at that time. For example, here are two paragraphs from this essay—published, the reader will bear in mind, less than one year after the start of world War I:

> What, then, are we to do, who desire peace and the civilization of all men? Hitherto the peace movement has confined itself chiefly to figures about the cost of war and platitudes on humanity. What do nations care about the cost of war, if by spending a few hundred millions in steel and gunpowder they can gain a thousand millions in diamonds and cocoa? How can love of humanity appeal as a motive to nations whose love of

> luxury is built on the inhuman exploitation of human beings, and who, especially in recent years, have been taught to regard these human beings as inhuman? . . .
>
> We then, who want peace, must remove the real causes of war. We have extended gradually our conception of democracy beyond our social class to all social classes in our nation; we have gone further and extended our democratic ideals not simply to all classes of our own nation, but to those other nations of our blood and lineage—to what we call "European" civilization. If we want real peace and lasting culture, however, we must go further. We must extend the democratic ideal to the yellow, brown and black peoples.

Du Bois here noted that colonialism treated its victims "as beasts of burden"; he insisted that: "We shall not drive war from this world until we treat them as free and equal citizens in a world-democracy of all races and nations." He demanded that, "The ruling of one people for another people's whim or gain must stop" else wars would recur. With passion and eloquence, he concluded this pioneering analysis:

> Twenty centuries after Christ, Black Africa, prostrate, raped, and shamed, lies at the feet of the conquering Philistines of Europe. Beyond the awful sea a black woman is weeping and waiting with her sons on her breast. What shall the end be? The world-old and fearful things: War and Wealth, Murder and Luxury? Or shall it be a new thing—a new peace and new democracy of all races: a great humanity of equal men?

The other of the two major efforts appeared in *Foreign Affairs*, July 1943, and its title conveyed its essence: "The Realities in Africa: European Profit or Negro Development? " Here Du Bois gave short shrift to the propaganda concerning racial "inferiority." "We must come back," he wrote, "to dollars, pounds, marks and francs." The reality was: "The process of exploitation that culminated in the British, French and German empires before the First World War turned out to be an investment whose vast returns depended on cheap labor, under strict colonial control, without too much interference from mawkish philanthropy."

The analytical advance over the 1915 essay is conveyed in this paragraph:

> Unless the question of racial status is frankly and intelligently faced it will become a problem not simply of Africa but of the world. More than the welfare of the blacks are involved. As long as there is in the world a reservoir of cheap labor

> that can raise the necessary raw materials, and as long as arrangements can be made to transport these raw materials to manufacturing countries, this body of cheap labor will compete directly or indirectly with European labor and will often substitute for European labor. This situation will increase the power of investors and employers over the political organization of the state, leading to agitation and revolt within the state on the part of the laboring classes and to wars between states which are competing for domination over these sources of profit. And if the fiction of inferiority is maintained, there will be added to all this the revolt of the suppressed races themselves, who, because of their low wages, are the basic cause of the whole situation.

The logical conclusion of the analysis was phrased this way:

> The social development of Africa for the welfare of Africans, with educated Africans in charge of the program, would certainly interfere with the private profits of foreign investment and would ultimately change the entire relationship of Africa to the modern world. Is the development of Africa for the welfare of Africans the aim? Or is the aim a world dominated by Anglo-Saxons, or at least by the stock of white Europe? If the aim is to keep Africa in subjugation just as long as possible, will it not plant the seeds of future hatreds and more war?

In his tour of duty as a professor at Atlanta University, from 1934 to mid-1944, Du Bois managed to establish, in 1940, the scholarly quarterly *Phylon;* he edited it during its formative years until he left the university to take up work, again—briefly—with the NAACP. With Du Bois as editor, this journal was crammed with material on Africa—notably in the contributions under his own signature. Thus, in the second issue of 1940 Du Bois wrote of the inequitable land distribution and of the very heavy penal laws in South Africa; in its third number he called attention to the outlawry in South Africa of union efforts by Black workers.

In the last issue of 1940 Du Bois examined at some length various proposals for resolving the "Native Problem" in South Africa—parallelism, assimilation, or some device for the total separation of Black from white; he showed that none would or could work and that only a democratic and egalitarian society offered a lasting solution. *Phylon* for 1941, again particularly in Du Bois' own writings, contains important information on the realities of oppression in South Africa and—especially—on evidence of resistance

against this on the part of Black men and women. South Africa, he summarized, in issue number 2 for 1942, has "the worst system of color caste in the world."

A final form of periodical writing by Du Bois was that of book reviews. Here, too, his concentration upon African materials, and especially South African, is notable. Two examples must suffice. In *The Crisis* for October 1927, Du Bois reviewed Sidney Olivier's *Anatomy of African Misery*, published that year in London by Hogarth Press. Summarizing that important book, Du Bois wrote that "slavery and caste exploited by capitalistic imperialism spread over the whole Southern half of Africa." He concluded that "South Africa is wrecking civilization" and closed with his repeated warning: "South Africa is a menace to the peace of the world." In the scholarly, Marxist-oriented quarterly, *Science and Society*, Summer 1953, Du Bois reviewed E. Solly Sachs' *The Choice Before South Africa*, published the preceding year in London by Turnstile Press. Noting that its author was a militant South African radical forced into exile, Du Bois—after detailing the contents of the book—concluded that "the methods used by the Nazis in Germany were identical in every respect to those used by enemies of trade unions in South Africa."

Most of Du Bois' twenty published books dealt in some way with Africa and several were devoted entirely to that continent. Note has already been taken of his first book—*The Suppression of the African Slave Trade*. In his notable biography of John Brown, first published in 1909, Du Bois does not fail to note that: "The mystic spell of Africa is and ever was over all America. It has guided her hardest work, inspired her finest literature, and sung her sweetest songs."

The Negro, one of the volumes in the Home University library of Modern Knowledge, published in New York and London in 1915, is a brief and pioneering effort at depicting the entire scope of Africa's past. It places also, within this context, the position of African-derived peoples in the United States, Latin America and the West Indies and shows the relationship between the exploitation of Africa and the rise of capitalism and imperialism in Europe and the United States.

Du Bois' second novel, *Dark Princess*, published by Harcourt, Brace in New York in 1928, sought through fiction to convey to readers a conception of the depths of discontent in the world of peoples of color and the critical need for significant change if catastrophic global violence were to be avoided. The plot is that of the development—and failure—of a world-wide conspiracy of people

of color—led by a princess of India—to undo the domination of the globe by European and American states.

In the 1920s an important popular publishing venture was what were called "Little Blue Books"—brief paperbacks which sold for five or ten cents and treated historical, philosophical and economic subjects. These were published by a radical-oriented company known as Haldeman-Julius Publications, located in Girard, Kansas. In 1929 Du Bois was given the opportunity of producing two such "Little Blue Books," and these appeared the next year. Each was a 64-page booklet and one treated *Africa, its Geography People and Products* while the other was concerned with *Africa: Its Place in Modern History*. The second book was somewhat repetitious of *The Negro* but it deals only with Africa and concentrates, as its title indicates, upon the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It places Africa within the context of European power politics and shows its close connection with the imperialism of the major powers. A feature of the little work is the great attention it pays to evidences of African resistance and initiative.

In the late 1930s Du Bois was given the opportunity of completing a fuller study of Africa than he could accomplish in either the 1915 or the 1930 studies. This eventuated into *Black Folk Then and Now: An Essay in the History and Sociology of the Negro Race* (Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1939). Here was a volume of 400 pages containing sixteen chapters and an extensive bibliography. The volume opened with a history of Africa and a description of some of its major early civilizations. The United States and the West Indies are not neglected in the work, but most space is given to Africa and its final four chapters concentrate upon modern Africa, especially upon questions of land ownership, the condition of the working masses, systems of education and of political control. The final chapter, "The Future of World Democracy," deals with major strikes and uprisings in the first third of the twentieth century; its concluding lines are:

> The proletariat of the world consists not simply of white European and American workers but overwhelmingly of the dark workers of Asia, Africa, the Islands of the Sea, and South and Central America. These are the ones who are supporting a superstructure of wealth, luxury, and extravagance. It is the rise of these people that is the rise of the world.

And then Du Bois repeats the words he first penned in 1900: "The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line."

Upon Du Bois' return, in 1944, to the NAACP—in the position of Director of Special Research—he concentrated his efforts upon what he understood to be the purpose for which he was hired, namely, to turn the attention of as much of the world's population as he—and the NAACP—could reach to problems of colonialism and especially to the question of the continued subjugation of most of Africa. One result was the appearance of a brief book, *Color and Democracy: Colonies and Peace* (Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1945).

The premise of this book was that with the world to come after the Second World War, "the majority of the inhabitants of earth, who happen for the most part to be colored, must be regarded as having the right and the capacity to share in human progress and to become co-partners in that democracy which alone can ensure peace among men, by the abolition of poverty, the education of the masses, protection from disease, and the scientific treatment of crime." The thought is developed that "colonies are the slums of the world" and that the slum dwellers are in righteous rebellion. If these slums are not ended, Du Bois warned, there would be not only these "justifiable revolts" but also "recurring wars of envy and greed because of the present inequitable distribution of gain among civilized nations." Statements from the Western Allies and their proposals—as those issuing from Dumbarton Oaks—showed a failure to consider this question of colonialism and the need for liberation. This was fatal, Du Bois insisted, for "so long as colonial imperialism exists, there can be neither peace on earth nor good will toward men."

Du Bois took a positive view of the Soviet Union here—as he had from 1919 on and was to do until his death—noting that it had not "like most nations, without effort to solve it, declared the insolubility of the problem of the poor, and above all, it has not falsely placed on the poor the blame of their wretched conditions."

Another volume resulted from Du Bois' position at the NAACP; this was *The World and Africa: An Inquiry into the Part Which Africa Has Played in World History*, published by Viking in New York City in 1947 and issued, with an additional hundred pages, by International Publishers in New York City two years after his death.

The book began with a consideration of the meaning of the just-concluded world-wide war (its original preface was dated May 1946). It moved on to an analysis of the impact of European colonialism, especially in Africa, during the preceding two centuries; of the "rape of Africa" in the four centuries beginning with the mid-fifteenth century; then a delineation of what Africa thus ravished had been; a history of Egypt, the Sudan, West and Central Africa and of Asia

in Africa until the sixteenth century, and finally, an inquiry into "the future of the darker races" whose coming liberation was held to be "indispensable to the fertilizing of the universal soil of mankind." The final thought, in the 1947 edition, was: "There can be no perfect democracy curtailed by color, race, or poverty. But with all we accomplish all, even Peace."

The 1965 edition—enriched with selections from periodical pieces by Du Bois in the 1950s—emphasized in particular the key role—after World War II—of United States corporations and banks—Morgan, Rockefeller, Ford, General Motors, General Electric, Firestone—in the continued exploitation of Africa and especially South Africa.

Du Bois' monumental fictional trilogy—*The Black Flame,* published 1957, 1959 and 1961 by Mainstream Publishers in New York City—was a novelized autobiographical presentation of what it meant to be a Black man in the United States from 1876 to 1956; it certainly does not neglect the consequence of Africa in general and its significance for Du Bois in particular.

His final volume—the posthumously published *Autobiography*—was written during the years 1958–61 and was published in full in 1968 by International Publishers. Again the central role of Africa, of Pan-Africanism, of the effort in general by Du Bois to alert the world to the realities of Africa and the necessity of achieving its liberation fills this book—as they had filled his incomparable life.

Du Bois was not only an editor, a skilled essayist, a poet and novelist, and a superbly trained social scientist who produced lasting works in sociology and history and a teacher who inspired hundreds of students during decades of instruction. Du Bois also was an agitator, an organizer, an activist in the struggles for the liberation of the Afro-American people, of the African peoples, of humanity and in the supreme effort he devoted to eliminating the scourge of war.

Note has already been taken of Du Bois' participation in the seminal 1900 Pan-African conference in London, his role in connection with a possible commercial relationship betwen Black people in the United States and portions of Africa, going back to 1902, the relationship in 1904 with the Ethiopian Progressive Association, and the Pan-African commitment of the Niagara Movement founded largely by Du Bois and headed by him until its dissolution and merging with the organization that became, in 1910, the NAACP. The development by 1909 of the idea of an Encyclopedia Africana on the part of Du Bois and the beginnings of his regular correspondence with African leaders and scholars at the turn of the

twentieth century were observed.

In 1911 Du Bois participated in the First All-Races Congress, held in England. Here appeared leading figures from the entire world, including China, Japan, Haiti, India, Persia, Turkey, the British West Indies, Egypt, the Sudan and Western Africa. Du Bois played a central role in the proceedings of this meeting and made lasting friendships; one of its basic conclusions was that the idea of racism was as false as it was pernicious.

Toward the end of World War I, colonial and oppressed peoples began to plan for a post-war world that might see an end to colonialism and oppression. This very much included African and African-derived peoples. Du Bois devoted much effort to persuading the other leaders of the NAACP to devote some of the energies and funds of the organization to Pan-African efforts. He had some success and his trip to Paris in 1919, funded by the NAACP, had among its objects inquiry into conditions of U.S. Black soldiers in France, the gathering of material for a projected history of African and Afro-American participation in the war—and the holding of a Pan-African Congress.

Du Bois managed to get some support and even meager funds for the latter from the British Labour Party and—with great difficulty—was able to call and lead the first Pan-African meeting since that of 1900 in Paris in 1919. Most of the commercial press of Europe and the United States denounced the gathering as too radical; a few papers denounced it as Bolshevik-inspired! But it did meet and an organization did come into existence and the idea of Pan-African unity in the struggle against colonialism and racism did take on organizational form—never thereafter to expire.

The second Pan-African Congress met in London, Paris and Brussels in 1921; appropriate resolutions were made, new friendships created and the concept of a permanent secretariat projected. The latter did not eventuate, nor did plans for an international journal in French and English dedicated to the movement. Still, with Du Bois as the driving force, another (Third) Pan-African Congress did meet in 1923 in Paris and Lisbon.

While there, Du Bois learned of his appointment by President Coolidge as Ambassador Extraordinary, representing the president of the United States at the 1924 inauguration of C. D. King as President of Liberia. Du Bois fulfilled this mission and made new and renewed old ties. He used the occasion of his first visit to Africa to enter other West African areas, notably Sierra Leone. This actual observation of Africa made a profound impression on Du Bois which found outlet in numerous newspaper columns, magazine articles and speeches heard in the United States by thousands, Black

and white.

Du Bois set his mind upon holding the Fourth Congress in Africa and for a time it appeared that France would agree upon Tunis as a venue. This finally was rejected, however; Britain and France also turned down requests for the holding of the conference in the West Indies. A result was that the Fourth Conference was not held until 1927 and then took place in New York City, with not only Du Bois' participation but also the active work of several Black women in the United States, notably Mary Church Terrell and Addie W. Hunton.

One result of Du Bois' visits in the 1920s to European museums and to Africa itself was his intense interest in the great wood and metal art work and music of that continent. Du Bois played a central role in promoting appreciation of these facets of African culture from 1924 to 1928 as part of the so-called Harlem Renaissance of the period.

Soon after 1927, the Great Depression—harmful to white people but catastrophic to Black folk—made Du Bois concentrate his mind and activities upon the United States, although, as earlier pages have shown, he did continue to publish through the thirties on Africa.

With World War II, Du Bois again concentrated his attention on Africa and the question of colonialism and the struggle for peace. As already shown, Africa was a major concern of Du Bois during his service with *Phylon* magazine, 1940–44. When in 1944 he returned to the NAACP he did so with the idea of devoting all of his energies to the battle against colonialism and in particular to the liberation of the African continent.

In this role he not only produced the articles and books already mentioned, dealing directly with Africa. He also—along with Walter White and Mary McLeod Bethune—served as consultant to the U.S. delegation at the founding of the United Nations in 1945.

Here Du Bois in private and public speech and in letters and published writings maintained his anti-colonial position and affirmed his disappointment that the Western Powers and the United States in the first place were not taking an anti-colonial stance but on the contrary seemed to be assuming that the post-war world, in that regard, would be similar to the world of 1939.

It was Du Bois' opposition to the Truman foreign policy of U.S. hegemony that finally determined Du Bois' removal, late in 1947, from his position with the NAACP; the leadership of that organization and especially Walter White himself, became part of the Truman bandwagon.

It was then that Du Bois joined Paul Robeson as leader of the heroic work of the Council on African Affairs, which was the

voice in the United States keeping alive opposition to colonialism in Africa and particularly to the infamous regime in South Africa. Though well past eighty, Du Bois agreed to run for U.S. senator from New York State in 1950; he made this an educational effort against colonialism and for disarmament and peace. While his American Labor Party candidacy was not successful, he did manage to get over 200,000 votes, according to the official count.

In this same period Du Bois undertook the leadership of the struggle in the United States against atomic armaments and for world peace. In this connection he headed the Peace Information Center, responsible for gathering well over two million signatures in the United States appealing for the banning of the A-bomb, and this in the face of McCarthyite terror. Meanwhile, in 1946 Du Bois had headed a resurrected Pan-African movement and tightened close connections with figures like Nkrumah, Azikiwe and Kenyatta.

A Washington gone quite berserk actually indicted Du Bois and four others as "unregistered foreign agents" because of the heroic work in connection with the Peace Information Center. World-wide protest and outrage at this atrocious act induced Washington to attempt to offer Du Bois a "deal"—if he would admit guilt, the government would assure him a suspended sentence. Du Bois indignantly rejected this in a letter to his attorneys and stated he would rather rot in jail for the rest of his life than agree to a lie with such an administration for such a purpose.

The global protest movement was successful and Du Bois and his fellow defendants were acquitted in this first great legal setback to McCarthyism.

Du Bois' lectures and world-wide travels, his leadership in the anti-war movement and his writings in favor of peace and against colonialism continued throughout the 1950s. It was in 1960 that President Nkrumah of Ghana invited Du Bois to Accra to undertake the setting up of a secretariat that would finally produce an Encyclopedia Africana. The present writer had the honor to drive Dr. and Mrs. Du Bois to the airport for the flight to Ghana—in October 1961—to undertake this formidable task.

A reporter at the airport asked Du Bois how many volumes he projected for the work. Du Bois replied that he thought ten stout volumes would be sufficient. How long will each volume's production take, the reporter asked. Du Bois—then 93 years old—responded with just the hint of a smile: "I should think it will take me about ten years per volume."

Du Bois, while in Accra, did advance the project considerably. In addition he continued to be asked to give advice to leaders of the

burgeoning African liberation movement which he did in public speeches, articles and in private communication.

Shortly before leaving for Accra, Du Bois had come to the decision that the program and ideas of the Communist Party of the United States were nearest to his own views. With the warlike policy of Washington and its policy of persecuting radicals and Communists, Du Bois decided that it might be some contribution to peace and sanity if he were not only to join that Party but to do so with a public announcement of the fact. This Du Bois did on October 1, 1961, and the act did gain worldwide attention, it did hearten fighters for peace and equality in the United States and it did serve to embarrass ruling powers in the United States.

In Ghana, the U.S. consulate refused to renew Dr. Du Bois' passport—under the terms of the McCarran Act, then still in force, it was a crime subject to ten years imprisonment for a Communist to have a passport! A result was that, having inquired of President Nkrumah, Dr. and Mrs. Du Bois abandoned their U.S. citizenship and became citizens of Ghana.

When Du Bois died, at the age of 95, in August 1963, President Nkrumah ordered a state funeral for this father of the modern Black liberation movement and the African liberation movement. All embassies and consulates were officially represented—except that of the United States.

Du Bois said in his Last Message—characteristically he had prepared this some time earlier—read at the grave-site by his wife Shirley Graham Du Bois:

> I have loved my work, I have loved people and my play, but always I have been uplifted by the thought that what I have done well will live long and justify my life; that what I have done ill or never finished can now be handed on to others for endless days to be finished, perhaps better than I could have done.

"Peace," he said, in this final word, "will be my applause." He added:

> One thing alone I charge you. As you live, believe in life. Always human beings will live and progress to greater, broader, and fuller life. The only possible death is to lose belief in this truth simply because the great end comes slowly, because time is long.

The accomplishments of this Titan assure immortality. His ideas, his prophecies, his admonitions, his examples are adornments to the

record of the human race. One of his great dreams—the full liberation of what he called his Motherland, his Africa—has not yet been realized although thanks in considerable part to his work a very great deal has been accomplished. All of it will be accomplished, probably within this twentieth century, as he once projected. Above all, in this regard, stands yet the abomination of apartheid South Africa, but its doom is written in the stars. It is for those of us who remain and who comprehend and cherish the legacy of Du Bois, to finish the great work he had begun and so mightily advanced, in particular to bring a fully democratic and egalitarian social order to South Africa and thus to immeasurably advance the prospects for a stable world peace.

W. E. B. DU BOIS—A MAN FOR PEACE

To help end war among nations was an enduring and basic commitment of William Edward Burghardt Du Bois. He did not see peace as a static or passive condition, however; rather, he saw it as a product of justice. In particular, peace would come and should come only with and through the elimination of racism, colonialism and human exploitation.

Du Bois was both advocate and activist. As advocate, he used the platform, every conceivable literary form and scientific inquiry. As advocate, he was especially journalist-editor and scholar. As an activist, he did not shun agitation; on the contrary, Du Bois thought agitation both healthy and necessary. And as an activist—though temperamentally averse to board meetings—he helped create and sustain vital organizations, especially the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Pan-African movement—seeking the two fundamental commitments of his life: the elimination of racism and colonialism and the elimination of war. One of his major insights, which he reiterated for some sixty years, was the interpenetration, the causal connection, the dialectical unity between anti-racism, anti-colonialism and anti-war.

In his prophetic way, he summed up much of his thinking on war in one paragraph of his very influential brief essay, "Credo," first published in 1904:

> I believe in the Prince of Peace. I believe that War is Murder. I believe that armies and navies are at bottom the tinsel and braggadacio of oppression and wrong; and I believe that the wicked conquest of weaker and darker nations by nations whiter and stronger but foreshadows the death of that strength.

Writing in the *New York Times* in 1909 he stated that the Afro-American people were now gaining "their own voices, their own ideals." Their testing by fire had tempered them, not consumed them and "self-realization" is being achieved. They are, he hoped over seventy years ago, "girding themselves to fight in the van of progress, not simply for their own rights as men, but for the ideals of the greater world in which they live: the emancipation of women, universal peace, democratic government, the socialization of

wealth, and human brotherhood." Whatever may have been true of others this certainly was the program he himself pursued until his death.

Until the last months of World War II, Du Bois' main contribution to the problem of achieving peace was to point out that this was not confined to white people. Unless, he insisted, global proportions were grasped and unless the racism and colonialism which made a farce of the so-called century of peace—to quote Henry Kissinger—from Waterloo to Sarajevo were combatted, the human condition would continue to be as bloody as in that century and the slaughter in Europe at each end of the "peaceful" century would recur. This was true since a basic cause, Du Bois was among the first and most persistent to insist, of the global conflicts among the so-called civilized states was the racism and colonialism which made a travesty of their pretensions toward civilization.

In *The Crisis* of May 1913, Du Bois castigated the existing peace societies for ignoring the fact that "the modern lust for land and slaves in Africa, Asia and the South Seas is the greatest and almost the only cause of war between the so-called civilized people." The "American peace movement," he continued, "thinks it bad policy to take up the problem of machine guns, natives and rubber." "For our part," he concluded, "we think that a little less dignity and dollars and a little more humanity would make the peace movement in America a great democratic philanthropy instead of an aristocratic refuge."

Du Bois never ceased hammering on this point—the organic connection between racism, colonialism and war. Some of his major essays, as "The African Roots of the War" in the *Atlantic*, May 1915—in some respects anticipating Lenin by two years—develop this in detail; he returned to it in the midst of World War II with another major effort: "The Realities in Africa," published in *Foreign Affairs*, July 1943.

In *Phylon* in 1941 he took note of eloquent peace statements from the Pope, the Quakers and Roosevelt and Churchill, but he found all to have the same fatal defect—they ignored the peoples of color who formed the vast majority of humanity!

For a period in the early 1920s and 1930s Du Bois thought of himself, as he once wrote, as being a "professional pacifist." The source for this feeling was Du Bois' chagrin that he had been taken in by Wilson's demagogy and had supported U.S. participation in the First World War. During this period he was attracted to Tolstoy and to Gandhi, but even during these years Du Bois never doubted the course taken in their days by Toussaint, or Nat Turner

or John Brown, nor the need of the militant mass resistance offered reaction during the Bolshevik Revolution.

After World War II he had the greatest admiration for Dr. King; he felt non-resistance might well have tactical value but that as a strategy for liberation it was inadequate. He noted too, in reviewing L. D. Reddick's book on King, in November 1959, that the latter lacked a viable socio-economic and political platform. When King remedied that in his final years, he was murdered.

When Du Bois returned to the NAACP in the summer of 1944 he viewed his duty, as he wrote to the African leader Dr. J. B. Danquah, in September, to concentrate on conditions of Black people "in Africa, the West Indies and other parts of the world," in order to help secure a "postwar condition" of such people which would reflect not servitude but independence. It was Du Bois who persuaded the Board of Directors of the NAACP to send a resolution —which he wrote—dated September 11, 1944, to President Roosevelt:

> As the territory of France, Italy, certain areas in the Balkans, and other lands occupied by people generally classed as "white" are recaptured from the enemy by the allied armies, provisions of one kind or another have been made to return control of those lands to the peoples who occupied them prior to the outbreak of World War II; but the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People notes with deep regret that when continental and insular areas of Africa and Asia, occupied by so-called colored colonials, are retaken, control and administration of them are immediately reassumed by the white colonial powers who ruled those areas before. Quite coldbloodedly, these colonial powers do not even attempt to ascertain what the wishes of the occupants of these lands may be. Quite to the contrary, their wishes are ignored. . . . It is imperative that the Allies now take positive action toward self-determination for colonial peoples as a goal which must be achieved before peace is truly secure.

While holding this position with the NAACP, as part of his duties, Du Bois wrote in the early months of 1945 a book whose title not only told its tale but conveyed an essential element in his own thinking: *Color and Democracy: Colonies and Peace.* Here Du Bois stated: "Not until we face the fact that colonies are a method of investment yielding unusual returns, or expected to do so, will we realize that the colonial system is part of the battle between capital and labor in the modern economy." And: "So long as colonial imperialism exists, there can be neither peace on earth nor good will

toward men."

The fact that the U.S. Navy purchased 2,400 copies of this book for distribution among its own personnel conveys something of the euphoria that prevailed in the final months of the war against fascism.

But when Du Bois served on behalf of the NAACP as one of the three unofficial consultants to the U.S. delegation at the founding of the United Nations, late in 1945, he reported keen disappointment in its failure to take an anti-colonial stand. Du Bois published sharp criticism of this neglect. This marks the beginning of the substantive rift between him and dominant elements of the NAACP leadership which finally resulted in 1948 in Du Bois again leaving the association which he had done more than anyone else to form and to sustain in its most difficult first two and a half decades.

Du Bois' commitment to peace continued and indeed intensified after World War II. It intensified because Du Bois at once understood that atomic weaponry had "revolutionized" war and the world. This was true, as he wrote over thirty years ago, because World War III would not result in devastation comparable to that caused by the first two but would actually be not war but global "suicide."

As advocate and activist, therefore, in the post-NAACP period—in the final eighteen years of his life—he threw himself into the work, with Paul Robeson and Alphaeus Hunton, of the Council on African Affairs and that of the Peace Information Center. This dual concentration—and the production of such a book as *The World and Africa* (1947)—reflected Du Bois' insistence on the unity of the struggle for peace, for the liberation of peoples of color, and for socialism.

Both organizations met the fiercest hostility and most foul persecution of the U.S. government, whose investigative arm of the so-called Department of Justice was in the grasp of that profoundly racist and fanatically reactionary J. Edgar Hoover.

The persecution finally destroyed the Council in the 1950s, deep in the McCarthyite hysteria. The attack on the Peace Information Center is another matter, fully detailed in Du Bois' book *In Battle for Peace* (1953). Here note will be taken of these facts.

At the age of eighty-two Du Bois accepted the urging of the leadership of the American Labor Party and ran on its ticket for the U.S. Senate from New York State. He did so, as he said, in order to advance the issues of peace and civil rights. At that age he carried forward a vigorous campaign throughout the state, curtailed more by meager funds than advanced years. He did speak to millions; he was credited with over two hundred thousand votes and he

not only upset Mr. Hoover but also distressed the cold warriors in the Oval Office.

Simultaneously, Du Bois undertook the leadership of the Peace Information Center, whose purposes were twofold. One, as the name conveys, was to serve as an information gathering and dispensing center for the growing grassroots anti-militarism and, especially, anti-A-bomb movement in the nation. The second was to oversee the gathering of signatures for what was called the Stockholm Peace Pledge.

That pledge was developed at a meeting of the World Partisans of Peace, held in Sweden in March 1950, and attended by 150 delegates from eighteen countries, including the United States and the Soviet Union.

The pledge, printed in most languages of the world, was in the form of a petition and had room for signatures. Within about fifteen months, half a billion people signed that pledge in every nation on earth. Over two million Americans signed it despite McCarthyite terror culminating in a public statement in July 1950 by Secretary of State Acheson that the pledge was a seditious document and the act of collecting signatures was subversive.

Dr. Du Bois, as head of the Peace Information Center, responded in an Open Letter meant for wide publication but actually printed by very few U.S. periodicals. In the course of denying Mr. Acheson's charges, Du Bois suggested—in words that will sound familiar today: "While there is yet time, Mr. Acheson, let the world know that in the future, the government of the United States will never be the first to use the atom bomb."

This Stockholm Pledge, this seditious document of 1950—makes interesting reading thirty-two years later. It was brief; this is its full text:

> We demand the absolute banning of the atomic weapon, an arm of terror and of mass extermination of populations.
>
> We demand the establishment of strict international control to ensure the implementation of this ban.
>
> We consider that the first government henceforth to use the atomic weapon against any country whatsoever will be committing a crime against humanity and should be treated as a war criminal.
>
> We call on all people of good will throughout the world to sign this appeal.

The late 1940s and early 1950s was the period of the deepest freeze of the cold war and the most rabid phase of McCarthyism. In addition to the implementation of the Smith and McCarran Acts

by the federal government and the jailing of many Communists, several states passed special anti-sedition and anti-Communist laws—with severe penalties—as the Ober Act in Maryland and the Feinberg Law in New York. Texas provided the death penalty for Communists.

Thousands of government employees, teachers and workers—especially militant unionists—were fired. Black men were executed en masse—as the seven youths in Martinsville, Virginia. The Secretary of the Navy was urging war in order to preserve peace, Nixon's distinguished political career began, Hiss was jailed, Paul Robeson was hounded, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were executed. *Collier's* magazine published a special issue showing the results of the defeat and occupation of the USSR in World War III by the U.S. The editors stated that the issue had been produced in "consultation with top political, military and economic thinkers—including top-level Washington officials and foreign-affairs experts here and abroad." Contributing to this enthusiastic description of life in U.S.-occupied USSR were Robert Sherwood, Allan Nevins, Stuart Chase, Arthur Koestler, J. B. Priestley—and Walter Winchell. The latter described with glee the performance of "Guys and Dolls" at the Bolshoi.

Those suspected of what were called Left-wing sympathies were labelled "soft-headed superdupes" by, for example, *Life* magazine early in 1949. Among the morons whose pictures were spread rogues-gallery fashion on the pages of the most widely circulated periodical of the time were Albert Einstein, Kirtley F. Mather, Harlow Shapley, Charles Chaplin, Thomas Mann, Langston Hughes, Dorothy Parker, Aaron Copland, Paul Robeson, Lillian Hellman, Clifford Odets and—W. E. B. Du Bois.

That in such a time and place the 83-year-old Du Bois would be indicted, arraigned, mugged and even handcuffed is less incredible when one is aware of this contrived insanity. That he would in this period earn that treatment from such authorities by his leadership in the battle for peace and for decency attests both to his effectiveness and his courage.

Du Bois was acquitted. This was due to worldwide protest (including from figures like Prime Minister Nehru of India), the strong fightback within the United States—led by Du Bois himself and his wife, Shirley Graham Du Bois, who toured the country and spoke to scores of thousands of people—a fine team of defense attorneys and the luck of a judge—a conservative Republican—who actually was a judge, in the person of James McGuire. The government, having presented its case, of course produced no substantive evidence of "foreign agency." Judge McGuire berated the prosecution in open

court for wasting time and money, told the defense it need not present its case, and directed an acquittal! This was the earliest reversal for McCarthyism and had a historically invigorating impact on all democratic and anti-war efforts.

In his remaining decade Du Bois continued his extra-ordinarily vigorous efforts for peace, civil rights, disarmament and the banning of atomic warfare. He published scores of articles and reviews, wrote his final *Autobiography,* a three-volume historical novel delineating what it meant to be Black in the U.S. from the 1880s to the 1950s, and was able to make a significant beginning—thanks to the efforts of his disciple, President Nkrumah of Ghana—in furthering one of his dreams, an Encyclopedia Africana, first projected by him in 1909.

Du Bois saw this scholarship in African life and history as part of his quest for truth, which, to him, was part of the search for justice and with that, the achievement of peace. Thus, consider his explanation of Pan-Africanism, back in 1921: "The absolute equality of races, physical, political and social, is the founding stone of world peace and human advancement." Again, in 1923, emphasizing the non-invidious character of Pan-Africanism, he wrote: "Pan-Africanism, . . . hopes to bring about peace and world democracy through the inclusion of all in opposition to the idea of aristocracy of races where the backward are to be ruled by the forward."

Searching for one paragraph from his own pen to sum up the essence of his thought in his fullest maturity—and also to convey some sense of the quality of the man—I've chosen this, written in November 1950. He had lost the Senatorial race, but he was convinced that his message would in time emerge triumphant:

> Social control of production and distribution of wealth is coming as sure as the rolling stars. The whole concept of property is changing and must change. Not even a Harvard School of Business can make greed into a science, nor can the unscrupulous ambition of a secretary of state use atomic energy forever for death instead of life.

In the summer of 1963, when a quarter of a million people gathered to confirm their dedication to Dr. King's dream, news came of Dr. Du Bois' death. The late Mr. Roy Wilkins announced the fact, remarked that the chief author of the slogans on their banners had passed away, and called for a minute's silence.

On June 12, 1980, while a million of us marched for peace and against war, for life and against death, again it was true that the main author of the slogans on those banners was Du Bois.

Du Bois loved Shelley and oft repeated these three lines in particular:

> To defy power, which seems omnipotent;
> To love, and bear; to hope till hope creates
> From its own wreck the thing it contemplates.

In his last message, read at his grave by his widow, he had written: "Peace will be my applause." Let us see to the fulfillment of that final prophecy.

INDEX

Aaron, Daniel, 71
Acheson, Dean, 201
Adams, Abigail, 63-64
Adams, Herbert, 140,
Adams, John, 75
Adams, John Q., 89, 121
Ames, Jessie D., 129
Ainslie, John, 37
Akerman, A. T., 111
Allen, James S., 80, 110
Anderson, E. N., 100
Anderson, Sherwood, 70
Ashton, John, 39

Baer, Max, 71
Bancroft, Frederic, 80, 81, 101-102
Banfield, Edwin, 58, 78, 103, 150
Banneker, Nancy, 39
Bean, Robert B., 140, 163
Beethoven, Ludwig von, 150
Bendiner, Robert, 71
Bennett, Gwendolyn, 70
Bentley, Emerson, 115
Berry, Mary F., 26
Bethune, Mary M., 193
Birney, James G., 96
Bismarck, Otto von, 147
Blair, L. H., 127
Blassingame, John, 26
Blyden, Edward, 183
Boarman, Raphael, 39
Boas, Franz, 182
Boies, Henry M., 147
Booth, James Wilkes, 119
Boyer, Richard, 120-22
Braden, Ann, 145
Braithwaite, Stanley, 70
Brawley, Benjamin, 80
Braxton, Carter, 43
Brockinbrough, Austin, 35
Brown, John, 37, 54, 57, 117-22, 188, 199
Brown, Mary, 119-20
Brown, William W., 96
Burgess, John W., 141
Burke, Emily P., 129
Burt, Cyril, 163
Byrd, William, 104

Cable, George W., 127
Calhoun, John C., 53, 89, 90, 105
Carnegie, Andrew, 126, 136
Carpenter, J. A., 109
Carroll, Charles, 41, 140
Carter, Landon, 46-47, 82, 84, 104
Carter, Robert, 46
Cato of Stono, 105
Cattell, Catherine, 37
Catterall, Helen, 104
Cayton, Revels, 168
Chamberlain, Joseph, 180
Chase, Samuel, 41
Chase, Stuart, 202
Chasteen, Edgar, 147
Chestnut, Mary B., 97, 128, 129
Chevigny, Paul, 163
Clayton, Eva, 146
Clayton, Powell, 113
Cochran, James, 35
Coffin, Levi, 96, 124
Cohen, Henig, 71
Commager, H. S., 73-76
Coolidge, Calvin, 192
Copland, Aaron, 202

Corliss, A. B., 115
Cox, Clara, 129
Cox, Nila Ruth, 145
Craven, Avery O., 56, 60
Crenshaw, Joseph, 45
Cruse, Harold, 69
Cullen, Countee, 70
Custis, John, 45

Danquah, J. D., 199
Davis, Jefferson, 78, 105
Dearington, Robert, 38
De Bow, J. D. B., 88
Dew, Thomas R., 79
Dix, Dorothea, 70-71
Dixon, Thomas, 79, 140, 169
Dorsey, Rachel, 39
Douglass, Frederick, 54, 65, 66, 80, 82, 96, 105, 119, 171, 181
Drake, St. Clair, 26
Du Bois, Shirley Graham, 194, 195, 202
Du Bois, W. E. B., 31, 63, 70, 71, 80, 83, 90, 101, 102, 109, 110, 113-14, 120, 123, 127, 136, 141, 168, 169, 171, 173, 174-75, 178-204
Dugdale, Richard, 147
Dunning, William A., 139
Dutton, S. T., 141
Dyer, Edward, 34

Eden, Joshua, 34
Edings, Benjamin, 31
Edison, Thomas, 150
Edmonds, Richard, 126
Einstein, Albert, 202
Eisinger, Chester, 71
Ellis, Havelock, 147
Elkins, Stanley, 25, 27, 69, 112
Embree, Elihu, 96
Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 121
Engerman, Stanley, 25, 78-108
Evans, W. McKee, 109, 123-23
Ewell, Jesse, 148
Ewusi, Kwesi, 181

Faulkner, William, 69
Fauset, Jessie, 70
Fay, Edwin H., 97-98
Fisher, John, 34, 35
Fisher, Rudolph, 70
Fitzhugh, George, 52, 78, 84, 103, 105
Flournoy, R. W., 115
Fogel, Robert, 25, 78-108
Ford, Henry, 164, 167
Forrest, N. B., 114
Forten, James, 80
Frank, Waldo, 70
Franklin, John Hope, 80, 83
Freeman, E. A., 140-41
Fulbright, William, 152
Fuller, Thomas, 37

Gabriel (slave rebel), 80, 105
Gadsden, Christopher, 42
Gandhi, M. K., 198
Gardner, Elijah, 38
Garrison, William Lloyd, 78, 80, 181
Garvey, Marcus, 181
Gaston, Paul M., 126-27
Gibbes, Henry, 37
Giddings, Franklin H., 148
Glazer, Nathan, 157
Grady, Henry, 126
Graham, Billy, 148
Grant, Madison, 139
Gravely, Jack, 25
Green, Shields, 119
Greene, Lorenzo J., 27, 83
Grimke sisters, 96
Gross, Bella, 80

Habersham, Joseph, 40
Hair, William, 125-26
Haldane, J. B. S., 151

Hamer, M. B., 29
Hamilton, Alexander, 75
Hammond, William A., 167
Handlin, Oscar, 70, 71
Hansberry, Leo, 182
Hardin, Garrett, 147
Harriman, E. H. (Mrs.), 149
Harris, Neil, 70
Harrison, Benjamin, 44
Havemeyer, H. O., 138
Hawley, Joseph, 124
Hayford, Casely, 183
Hazel, J. A., 87
Hazellep, Nell, 31
Hellman, Lillian, 202
Hemingway, Ernest, 70
Henretta, James, 76
Hershaw, L. M., 182
Hilton, Bruce, 146
Hiss, Alger, 202
Hitler, Adolph, 152, 157, 164, 166, 170
Hixson, W. B., 171-77
Hoar, George F., 137
Hoffman, F. J., 69-70
Hofstadter, Richard, 70
Holmes, Oliver Wendell, 151
Hook, John, 36
Hoover, Herbert, 128
Hoover, J. Edgar, 201
Howe, Mark, 171
Hughes, Langston, 202
Hunton, Addie, 193
Hunton, Alphaeus, 183, 200
Hyatt, A., 39

Jackson, Andrew, 124
Jackson, Luther P., 83
Jay, John, 75
Jefferson, Peter, 46
Jefferson, Thomas, 42, 46, 75, 83
Johnson, Andrew, 124
Johnson, James Weldon, 70, 172
Johnson, Michael P., 26, 28
Johnston, James Hugo, 31, 104
Johnston, Thomas, 35
Jupiter, alias Gibb, 33

Kaiser, Ernest, 121
Kealing, H. T., 181
Kemble, Frances Ann, 129
Kennedy, Edward M., 145
Kenyatta, Jomo, 194
King, C. D., 192
King, Martin Luther, Jr., 199, 203
Kipling, Rudyard, 142
Kissinger, Henry, 198
Kulikoff, Allan, 76

LaFollette, Robert M., 173
Lambton, Richard, 40
Landman, J. H., 151-52
Laughlin, H. H., 150-52
Laurens, Henry, 42
Lawson, Elizabeth, 80
Lee, Robert E., 119
Lenders, D. J., 184
Lenin, V. I., 67, 176, 185, 198
Lewis, Sinclair, 70
Lincoln, Abraham, 58, 119, 124, 134, 171
Locke, John, 53
Lodge, Henry Cabot, 148
Lombroso, Cesare, 147
Louis, Joe, 71
Lowndes, Rawlins, 42

MacDonnell, James, 37
Madison, James, 45
Maguire, James, 202
Main, Jackson T., 76
Mall, Franklin P., 140
Malthus, Thomas, 144
Markey, Edward, 153
Marshall, Mary, 31

Marx, Karl, 54, 63, 66, 67, 80, 134
Mason, George, 44
Mather, Kirtley, 202
McCarthy, Joseph, 89
McDougall, William, 139
McKim, W. D., 147
McKinley, William, 134
Meader, Daniel, 28
Miller, George F., 175
Milton, John, 150
Minton, T. J., 181
Mitchell, Broadus, 88
Mitchell, Margaret, 84
Mitchell, S. A., 141
Mohl, Raymond, 76
Monroe, James, 105
Morais, Herbert, 120
Morel, B. A., 147
Morgan, Edmund, 31
Morgan, J. P., 126, 136, 138
Morison, Samuel E., 73
Moynihan, Daniel P., 69, 103
Mullin, G. W., 27
Munford, Robert, 33
Murray, F. H., 182

Nash, Gerald, 76
Nehru, J., 202
Nelson, Truman, 121
Nevins, Allan, 101, 120, 202
Newell, Bertha, 129
Nixon, Richard M., 58, 90, 103, 142, 148, 202
Nkrumah, K., 183, 194, 195, 203
North, William, 98

Oakes, James, 26
Oates, S. B., 120, 121
Okihiro, Gary Y., 26
Olivier, Sidney, 188
Olsen, Otto, 109
Olson, Harry, 150
Ovington, Mary White, 175

Page, W. H., 126
Parker, Theodore, 121
Parsons, John, 36
Patterson, W. L., 168
Payne, William, 34
Peek, R. L., 109, 114
Pennypacker, S. W., 148, 149
Pessen, Edward, 76
Pharr, J. N., 125
Phillips, U. B., 27, 79, 83, 84, 94, 102, 104, 114-15
Phillips, Wendell, 54, 121, 181
Pierce, Clovis, 145
Pierce, Franklin, 88
Pinckney, Thomas, 29
Pinckney, William, 41
Pitkin, Walter, 152
Plessy, Homer, 135
Popenoe, Paul, 152
Porter, Kenneth W., 80
Post, Louis, 173-74
Powell, Adam C., 184
Price, J. P., 127
Priestley, J. B., 202

Quarles, Benjamin, 122

Randolph, John, 43
Reddick, L. D., 199
Redway, John, 141
Reed, T. E., 100
Relf, Lonnie, 144
Richardson, J. P., 59
Ripley, W. Z., 148
Robertson, George, 36
Robeson, Paul, 168, 185, 193, 200, 202
Rockefeller, J. D., 183
Roosevelt, Eleanor, 158
Roosevelt, F. D., 199
Roosevelt, Theodore, 134, 148
Rose, Arnold, 69
Rose, John, 38
Rosenberg, Ethel, 202
Rosenberg, Julius, 202

Rosenfeld, Bernard, 146
Rothman, David, 70
Ruchames, Louis, 121
Ruffin, Edward, 44, 79
Ruffin, Edmund, 44, 56-61, 119, 121

Sachs, E. S., 188
Schurz, Carl, 171
Scott, Anne F., 127-30
Shanker, Albert, 157, 159
Shapiro, Herbert, 109
Shelley, Percy B., 204
Sherwood, Robert, 202
Simons, Charles, 35
Smith, Gerrit, 80
Smith, G. W., 115
Smith, James McCune, 90
Smith, Wilson, 70
Smith, W. H., 112
Soltow, Lee, 76
Spencer, Herbert, 139
Sproul, William, 149
Stavis, Barrie, 120, 122
Steuer, Max, 120
Stoddard, Lothrop, 150
Storey, Moorfield, 137, 171-77
Stowe, Harriet Beecher, 97
Strong, Josiah, 71
Styron, William, 78, 91
Sumner, Charles, 171
Sylvester-Williams, Henry, 179-80

Tate, Thad, Jr., 28
Terrell, Mary Church, 193
Terry, William, 36
Thornstrom, Stephan, 70
Thompson, Hugh M., 139
Thompson, Josiah,
Thoreau, Henry David, 121
Thurman, Wallace, 70
Tillman, Benjamin, 137, 139
Toomer, Jean, 70
Tolstoy, Leo, 198
Tourgee, A. W., 110, 126
Trelease, Allen W., 109-16
Trotter, William, 136, 174, 182
Troup, George, 40
Truman, Harry S., 193
Truth, Sojourner, 80
Tubman, Harriet, 54, 80, 105
Turner, Nat, 54, 70, 78, 80, 85, 105, 199
Tutwiler, Julia, 129
Twain, Mark, 171
Tyler, John, 89

Upshur, Abel, 89

Vanderhorst, A., 29
Vauchier, John, 38
Vesey, Denmark, 80, 105
Villard, Oswald G., 120, 174, 175

Waddell, A. M., 139
Waldron, Eric, 70
Waldron, J. M., 175
Walker, David, 81
Walker, Robert J., 89
Walker, William, 121
Walling, W. E., 175
Walters, Alexander, 180, 181
Ward, John W., 71
Washington, Booker T., 71, 127, 135, 174, 182
Washington, George, 45-46, 98
Washington, Martha, 45
Watterston, Henry, 126
Watts, George, 38
Weatherley, Joseph, 36, 40
Webster, Noah, 70
Wells-Barnett, Ida, 130
White, George H., 125, 127, 140
White, Walter, 193
Wilkins, Roy, 203
Williams, Barbara, 39

Williams, Benoni, 35
Williams, David, 36
Williams, Marietta, 144
Wilson, Benjamin, 35
Wilson, Woodrow, 198
Winchell, Walter, 202
Windley, Lathan A., 27ff.
Wise, Henry S., 121
Wolfe, Sidney, 146
Wood, Peter, 28
Woods, Leighton, 33
Woodson, Carter G., 80, 117
Woodward, C. Vann, 78, 120
Worthington, B. J., 31
Wright, Carroll, 86
Wright, Richard, 71

Yancey, W. L., 121

RACISM, IMPERIALISM, & PEACE

Herbert Aptheker is America's outstanding Marxist historian. This stimulating collection of essays provides an excellent introduction to a brilliant intellectual who has devoted his life's work to the cause of anti-racism and human liberation. The volume presents an incisive contribution to social theory and Marxist historiography.

—Manning Marable, Chair, Black Studies, Ohio State University; author of *Black American Politics* and *W. E. B. DuBois*

After wading through the establishment academic literature, one turns with relief and enthusiasm to Herbert Aptheker's essays on racism, capitalism, imperialism, the falsification of history, and the struggle for democracy. Done in fine style and with cogent content, Aptheker's writings continue to inspire and nourish many American progressives.

—Michael Parenti, author of *Inventing Reality*

I strongly recommend these essays, in which the fight against racism and the link between that fight and anti-imperialist and anti-war efforts are guiding threads, as exemplars of Marxist-Leninist scholarship combining historical importance with contemporary relevance.

—David Laibman, *Science & Society*

MEP PUBLICATIONS, c/o ANTHROPOLOGY DEPT.
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, 215 FORD HALL
224 CHURCH ST. S.E., MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455

ISBN 930656-50-4